



भारत का राजपत्र The Gazette of India

सी.जी.-डी.एल.-सा.-27032024-253393
CG-DL-W-27032024-253393

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY
साप्ताहिक
WEEKLY

सं. 10] नई दिल्ली, मार्च 10—मार्च 16, 2024, शनिवार/फाल्गुन 20—फाल्गुन 26, 1945
No. 10] NEW DELHI, MARCH 10—MARCH 16, 2024, SATURDAY/PHALGUNA 20—PHALGUNA 26, 1945

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह पृथक संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके
Separate Paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (ii)
PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों (रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) द्वारा जारी किए गए सांविधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं
Statutory Orders and Notifications Issued by the Ministries of the Government of India
(Other than the Ministry of Defence)

वित्त मंत्रालय
(राजस्व विभाग)
नई दिल्ली, 8 मार्च, 2024

का.आ. 483.—केन्द्र सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 के नियम 10 के उप-नियम (4) के अनुसरण में राजस्व विभाग के केन्द्रीय अप्रत्यक्ष कर एवं सीमाशुल्क बोर्ड के अधीन, निम्नलिखित कार्यालयों, जिनके 80 प्रतिशत से अधिक कर्मचारियों ने हिन्दी का कार्य साधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, को अधिसूचित करती है:

1. केन्द्रीय माल और सेवाकर एवं केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, अहमदाबाद, उत्तर
2. केन्द्रीय माल और सेवाकर एवं केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, गौतम बुद्ध नगर
3. केन्द्रीय माल और सेवाकर एवं केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, जयपुर अपील
4. केन्द्रीय माल और सेवाकर एवं केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, दिल्ली, अपील-II
5. विधिकार्य निदेशालय, नई दिल्ली

6. केंद्रीय माल और सेवाकर एवं केंद्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, पटना-I
7. केंद्रीय माल और सेवाकर एवं केंद्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, पटना-II
8. प्रणाली एवं आंकड़ा प्रबंधन महानिदेशालय, नई दिल्ली
9. केंद्रीय माल और सेवा कर एवं केंद्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, भोपाल, लेखा परीक्षा
10. केंद्रीय माल और सेवाकर एवं केंद्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, मुंबई, अपील-II
11. केंद्रीय माल और सेवाकर एवं केंद्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, जम्मू, लेखा परीक्षा
12. केंद्रीय माल और सेवाकर एवं केंद्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, शिमला
13. केंद्रीय माल और सेवाकर एवं केंद्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, कोचीन, अपील
14. केंद्रीय माल और सेवाकर एवं केंद्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, अलवर
15. केंद्रीय माल और सेवा कर एवं केंद्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, अहमदाबाद (दक्षिण)
16. केंद्रीय माल और सेवा कर एवं केंद्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, इंदौर
17. केंद्रीय माल और सेवा कर एवं केंद्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, इलाहाबाद (अपील)
18. केंद्रीय माल और सेवा कर एवं केंद्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, गुरुग्राम (लेखा परीक्षा)
19. केंद्रीय माल और सेवा कर एवं केंद्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, लखनऊ
20. केंद्रीय माल और सेवा कर एवं केंद्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, नई दिल्ली (लेखा परीक्षा-I)
21. केंद्रीय माल और सेवा कर एवं केंद्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, नई दिल्ली (अपील-I)
22. केंद्रीय माल और सेवा कर एवं केंद्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, पंचकुला, अपील
23. केंद्रीय माल और सेवा कर एवं केंद्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, फरीदाबाद
24. मानव संसाधन विकास महानिदेशालय, नई दिल्ली
25. मुख्य आयुक्त का कार्यालय, सीमा शुल्क, मुम्बई जोन- III
26. मुख्य आयुक्त का कार्यालय, सीजीएसटी एवं केंद्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, जयपुर
27. केंद्रीय माल और सेवा कर एवं केंद्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, रायगड (लेखा परीक्षा)
28. सीमा शुल्क (नि.) लखनऊ, उत्तर प्रदेश
29. सीमा शुल्क आयुक्त (हवाई अड्डा एवं सामान्य) का कार्यालय, नई दिल्ली

[फा. सं. ई-11017/3/2017-हिन्दी-2-अधिसूचना]

ले.कर्नल एम.के. सिंह, निदेशक (राजभाषा)

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Revenue)

New Delhi, the 8th March, 2024

S.O. 483.—In pursuance of sub-rule (4) of Rule 10 of the Official Languages (Use for Official Purpose of the Union) Rules, 1976, the Central Government, hereby notifies, the following offices under Central Board of Indirect Taxes and Customs, Department of revenue where more than 80% staff has acquired the working knowledge of Hindi:

1. Central Goods and Services Tax and Central Excise, Ahmedabad, North
2. Central Goods and Services Tax and Central Excise, Gautam Buddha Nagar
3. Central Goods and Services Tax and Central Excise, Jaipur Appeal
4. Central Goods and Services Tax and Central Excise, Delhi, Appeal- II
5. Directorate of Legal Affairs, New Delhi
6. Central Goods and Services Tax and Central Excise, Patna- I.

7. Central Goods and Services Tax and Central Excise, Patna- II
8. Directorate General of Systems and Data Management, New Delhi
9. Central Goods and Services Tax and Central Excise, Bhopal, Audit
10. Central Goods and Services Tax and Central Excise, Mumbai, Appeal -II
11. Central Goods and Services Tax and Central Excise, Jammu, Audit
12. Central Goods and Services Tax and Central Excise, Shimla
13. Central Goods and Services Tax and Central Excise, Cochin, Appeal
14. Central Goods and Services Tax and Central Excise, Alwar
15. Central Goods and Services Tax and Central Excise, Ahmedabad (South)
16. Central Goods and Services Tax and Central Excise, Indore
17. Central Goods and Services Tax and Central Excise, Allahabad (Appeal)
18. Central Goods and Services Tax and Central Excise, Gurugram (Audit)
19. Central Goods and Services Tax and Central Excise, Lucknow
20. Central Goods and Services Tax and Central Excise, New Delhi (Audit- I)
21. Central Goods and Services Tax and Central Excise, New Delhi (Appeal-I)
22. Central Goods and Services Tax and Central Excise, Panchkula, Appeal
23. Central Goods and Services Tax and Central Excise, Faridabad
24. Directorate General of Human Resource Development, New Delhi
25. Office of the Chief Commissioner of Customs, Mumbai Zone- III
26. Office of the Chief Commissioner, CGST and Central Excise, Jaipur
27. Central Goods and Services Tax and Central Excise, Raigad (Audit)
28. Customs (Pre.) Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh
29. Office of the Commissioner of Customs (Airport & General), New Delhi

[F. No. E-11017/3/2017- Hindi-2-Notification]

Lt. Col. M.K. SINGH, Director (OL)

शिक्षा मंत्रालय**(उच्चतर शिक्षा विभाग)**

नई दिल्ली, 27 फरवरी, 2024

का.आ. 484.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 के नियम- 10 के उप- नियम (4) के अनुसरण में शिक्षा मंत्रालय (उच्चतर शिक्षा विभाग और स्कूल शिक्षा एवं साक्षरता विभाग) के अंतर्गत निम्नलिखित संस्थानों/परिषदों/विद्यालयों को, ऐसे कार्यालय के रूप में, जिसके 80% से अधिक कर्मचारियों ने हिंदी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, अधिसूचित करती है-

क्र. सं.	कार्यालय का व्यौरा
उच्चतर शिक्षा विभाग के नियंत्रणाधीन संस्थान	
1.	भारतीय प्रबंध संस्थान, लखनऊ प्रबंध नगर, आईआईएम रोड, लखनऊ- 226013
2.	भारतीय प्रौद्योगिकी संस्थान जम्मू, जगती, एनएच 44, जम्मू- 181221
3.	भारतीय प्रौद्योगिकी संस्थान, खण्डवा रोड, सिमरोल, इंदौर- 453 552

4.	विश्वेश्वरय्या राष्ट्रीय प्रौद्योगिकी संस्थान, नागपूर-440010
5.	सरदार वल्लभभाई राष्ट्रीय प्रौद्योगिकी संस्थान, सूरत, गुजरात
6.	इंदिरा गांधी शारीरिक शिक्षा एवं खेल विज्ञान संस्थान, बी-ब्लॉक, विकासपुरी, नई दिल्ली- 110018
7.	भारतीय प्रबंध संस्थान, अमृतसर
8.	दक्षिण बिहार केंद्रीय विश्वविद्यालय, जिला- गया, बिहार
स्कूल शिक्षा एवं साक्षरता विभाग के नियंत्रणाधीन क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय/विद्यालय	
9.	क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय, देहरादून, केन्द्रीय माध्यमिक शिक्षा बोर्ड
10.	क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय, भुवनेश्वर, केन्द्रीय माध्यमिक शिक्षा बोर्ड
11.	क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय, पुणे, केन्द्रीय माध्यमिक शिक्षा बोर्ड
12.	क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय, भोपाल, केन्द्रीय माध्यमिक शिक्षा बोर्ड
13.	क्षेत्रीय शिक्षा संस्थान अजमेर, राष्ट्रीय शैक्षिक अनुसंधान और प्रशिक्षण परिषद, कप्तान दुर्गा प्रसाद चौधरी मार्ग, अजमेर-305004
14.	डॉ. राजेन्द्र प्रसाद, केंद्रीय विद्यालय, प्रेसिडेंट एस्टेट नई दिल्ली-110004
15.	केंद्रीय विद्यालय, घुमारवी नजदीक शिव मंदिर घुमारवी जिला बिलासपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश – 174021
16.	केंद्रीय विद्यालय, सी.आई.एस.एफ. सूरजपुर, एस.एस.जी.कैंपस, ग्रेटर नोएडा, उत्तर प्रदेश -201306
17.	केन्द्रीय विद्यालय बावली, बागपत, उत्तर प्रदेश -250621
18.	केंद्रीय विद्यालय, सैक्टर 28, रोहिणी, पॉकेट-17, ब्लॉक- सी, सैक्टर-28, दिल्ली-110042
19.	केंद्रीय विद्यालय बी आर बी एन एम पी एल, मैसूरु नोट मुद्रण नगर मैसूरु-570003
20.	केंद्रीय विद्यालय गौरीबिदनूर, सिरिकल्चर कार्यालय भवन, नेताजी स्टेडियम के पास, गौरीबिदनूर चिकबल्लापुर 561208 कर्नाटक
21.	केंद्रीय विद्यालय वीरपुरा गंगावती एम एन एम गर्ल्स पी यू कॉलेज कैम्पस, गंगावती, कोप्पल, जिला कर्नाटक-583227
22.	केंद्रीय विद्यालय रेलवे कॉलोनी यशवंतपुर बेंगलुरु-560022 कर्नाटक राज्य
23.	केंद्रीय विद्यालय सदलगा, कुवेम्पु सेनिटरी मॉडल स्कूल कैंपस, सदलगा, चिककोडी तालुक, बेलगावी-591239
24.	केंद्रीय विद्यालय दोणिमलै, बल्लारी जिला कर्नाटक-583118
25.	केंद्रीय विद्यालय क्र.1, अंगुल, गांधीमार्ग, अनगुल-759122
26.	केंद्रीय विद्यालय आस्का, धोबाड़ी, पो- कुंभीर गंजाम ओडिशा-761111
27.	केंद्रीय विद्यालय क्र.1 बालेश्वर, आई. जी. मार्ग, प्रूफ कॉलोनी, बालेश्वर- 756001 (ओडिशा)
28.	केंद्रीय विद्यालय क्रमांक-2, बालेश्वर, गणेश्वरपुर, जानूगंज, रेमूना, बालेश्वर, ओडिशा, पिन-756019
29.	केंद्रीय विद्यालय बरगढ़, बरडोल, डांग चौक, एसीसी सीमेंट रोड, बरगढ़, जिला- बरगढ़ - 768038
30.	केंद्रीय विद्यालय मुर्गाबाडी, मुर्गाबाडी, पो. अ. -भंजपुर, जिला मयूरभंज, बारिपदा, ओडिशा - 757002

31.	केंद्रीय विद्यालय भवानीपटना निकट राजकीय आईटीआई भवानीपटना, कलाहाण्डि, ओडिशा - 766001
32.	केंद्रीय विद्यालय संख्या-3, भुवनेश्वर प्रगति विहार कॉलोनी, मंचेस्वर भुवनेश्वर-751017
33.	केंद्रीय विद्यालय क्रमांक-4, नीलाद्रि विहार पो. शैलश्री विहार भुवनेश्वर, जिला- खुर्दा
34.	केंद्रीय विद्यालय नं. 6, पोखरीपुट, भुवनेश्वर, जिला- खुर्दा, ओडिशा-751020
35.	केंद्रीय विद्यालय बौद्ध, पता- राजस्व कॉलोनी के पास, बौद्ध पो/ जिला- बौद्ध, पिन- 762014, ओडिशा
36.	केंद्रीय विद्यालय क्रमांक 2 कटक, मधुपटना, कटक, ओडिशा- 753010
37.	केंद्रीय विद्यालय धरमगढ़, वोक्शनल कॉलेज परिसर, धरमगढ़, कालाहाण्डी, ओडिशा- 766015
38.	केंद्रीय विद्यालय दिगपहंडी, गंजाम, ओडिशा- 761012
39.	केंद्रीय विद्यालय, गजपति बेतागुडा, पो- जम्मी, वाया- पारलाखेमूण्डी, जिला- गजपति ओडिशा पिन- 761201
40.	केंद्रीय विद्यालय गोपालपुर मिलिट्री स्टेशन, पो. ओ. गोलाबन्ध, जिला: गंजाम (ओडिशा) 761052
41.	केंद्रीय विद्यालय, हिंजिलिकाटु, वृंदावन विद्यापीठ परिसर, गंजाम, ओडिशा- 761102
42.	केंद्रीय विद्यालय जगतसिंहपुर, तरिकुंद उच्च विद्यालय, तरिकुंद, डाकघर- तरिकुंद, जगतसिंहपुर, ओडिशा- 574102
43.	केंद्रीय विद्यालय जाजपुर, ग्राम- अकरपड़ा, पो- श्रीधरपुर, जिला- जाजपुर, ओडिशा-755062
44.	केंद्रीय विद्यालय, कंधमाल, ग्राम- मुलागुदारी, पो- गुदारी, वाया- खजूरीपाड़ा, जिला- कंधमाल, ओडिशा- 762012
45.	केंद्रीय विद्यालय, एनटीपीसी, कनिहा, पोस्ट- दीपशिखा, जिला, अंगुल, पिन- 759147
46.	केंद्रीय विद्यालय, बारिमुल, केंद्रापड़ा स्थान: बारिमुल, पो.- तिलोत्तमादेईपुर जिला- केंद्रापड़ा, ओडिशा- 754250
47.	केंद्रीय विद्यालय, केन्दुझर, पो.- रॉकी, केन्दुझर, जिला- केन्दुझर, ओडिशा-758002
48.	केंद्रीय विद्यालय कुत्रा सेंटर प्राथमिक विद्यालय, कुत्रा, जिला सुंदरगढ़- 770018
49.	केंद्रीय विद्यालय मल्कानगिरी, पोस्ट + जिला- मल्कानगिरी, ओडिशा- 764048
50.	केंद्रीय विद्यालय नबरंगपुर, चुटियागुडा, ओडिशा- 764059
51.	केंद्रीय विद्यालय, नयागड़ (ओडिशा), मुक्तापुर (नियर हाऊसिंग बोर्ड कॉलोनी नयागड़), पो- भाटसाही, भाया- नयागढ़-2, पिन- 752070
52.	केंद्रीय विद्यालय महलडिहा, रायरंगपुर, मयूरभन्ज (ओडिशा)- 757043
53.	केंद्रीय विद्यालय रायगड़ा, उत्कलमणिनगर, जयरामगुडा, रायगड़ा, ओडिशा- 765002
54.	केंद्रीय विद्यालय सोनपुर, डी. आई. ई. टी. प्रांगण, सोनपुर, ओडिशा- 767017
55.	केन्द्रीय विद्यालय, व्यासनगर एन.सी. हाई स्कूल परिसर, पो. जाजपुर रोड, ओडिशा- 755019
56.	केन्द्रीय विद्यालय गुनुपुर, बेल छात्रावास परिसर, ओल्ड बैंक स्ट्रीट, गुनुपुर, जिला रायगड़ा, पिन- 765022
57.	केन्द्रीय विद्यालय आनंदपुर, 646 एम +6 एफ 8, आनंदपुर, ओडिशा- 758021

58.	केन्द्रीय विद्यालय छत्रपुर, ऑनस्लो इंस्टीट्यूशन परिसर, छत्रपुर, जिला : गंजाम (ओडिशा), पिन कोड: 761020
59.	केन्द्रीय विद्यालय भारतीय प्रौद्योगिकी संस्थान भुवनेश्वर, भारतीय प्रौद्योगिकी संस्थान भुवनेश्वर परिसर, अरगुल, जटनी, जिला- खुर्दा, ओडिशा- 752050
60.	केन्द्रीय विद्यालय एमसीएल जगन्नाथ क्षेत्र, सेंट्रल कॉलोनी, घंटापड़ा, तालचर, अंगुल, ओडिशा - 759116
61.	केन्द्रीय विद्यालय एमसीएल सुभद्रा क्षेत्र, पो- दक्षिण बालंद, तालचर, जिला- अंगुल, ओडिशा, पिन- 759116
62.	केन्द्रीय विद्यालय खरियार, राजा ए टी उच्च विद्यालय, एम. ई. सेक्शन खरियार, जिला - नुआपाड़ा (ओडिशा)- 766107

[फा. सं. 11011/3/2022-रा.भा. ए.]

सैय्यद इकराम रिज़वी, संयुक्त सचिव

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION
(Department of Higher Education)

New Delhi, the 27th February, 2024

S.O. 484.—In pursuance of Sub-Rule (4) of Rule-10 of the Official Language (use for official purpose of the Union) Rules-1976, the Central Government hereby notifies the following offices under the Ministry of Education (Department of Higher education and Department of school Education and Literacy) as office, where 80% members of the staff have acquired the working knowledge of Hindi-

Sl. No.	Details of the Institute.
Institute under control of Department of Higher Education	
1.	Indian Institute of Management Lucknow Prabandh Nagar, IIM Road, Lucknow- 226 013 (U P) India
2.	Indian Institute of Technology Jammu, Jagti, NH44, Jammu- 181221
3.	Indian Institute of Technology Khandwa Road, Simrol, Indore- 453 552
4.	Visvesvaraya National Institute of Technology, Nagpur-440010
5.	Sardar Vallabhbhai National Institute of Technology, Surat, Gujarat
6.	Indira Gandhi Institute of Physical Education and Sports Science B- Block, Vikaspuri, New Delhi- 110018
7.	Indian Institute of Technology, Amritsar
8.	Central University of South Bihar, District- Gaya, Bihar
Regional Offices/Schools under Department of School Education & Literacy	
9.	Regional Office, Dehradun, Central Board of Secondary Education
10.	Regional Office, Bhuvaneshwar, Central Board of Secondary Education
11.	Regional Office, Pune, Central Board of Secondary Education
12.	Regional Office, Bhopal, Central Board of Secondary Education
13.	Regional Education Institute Ajmer, National Council of Educational Research and Training, Captain Durga Prasad Chaudhary Marg, Ajmer-305004
14.	Dr. Rajendra Prasad, Kendriya Vidyalaya President's Estate New Delhi-110004
15.	Kendriya Vidyalaya Ghumarwin, Near Shiv Mandir, Ghumarwin Distt. Bilaspur Himachal Pradesh -174021
16.	Kendriya Vidyalaya, C.I.S.F. Surajpur, S.S.G. Campus, Greater Noida, Uttar Pradesh -201306

17.	Kendriya Vidyalaya, Baoli, Baghpat, Uttar Pradesh- 250621
18.	Kendriya Vidyalaya, Sector-28, Pocket-17, Block-C Sector-28, Rohini, Delhi-110042
19.	Kendriya Vidyalaya BRBNMPL Mysuru Note Mudaran Nagar Mysuru 570003
20.	Kendriya Vidyalaya Gouribidanur, Sericulture Office Building, Near Netaji Stadium, Gouribidanur Chikkaballapur- 561208 Karnataka
21.	Kendriya Vidyalaya Virupura Gangavathi, M N M Girls PU College Campus, Gangavathi, Koppal, Dist. Karnataka-583227
22.	Kendriya Vidyalaya Railway Colony Yeshwanthpur Bengaluru 560022 Karnataka State
23.	Kendriya Vidyalaya Sadalaga, Kuvempu Sanitary Model School Campus, Sadalaga Chikkodi Taluk, Belagavi-591239
24.	Kendriya Vidyalaya Donimalai Ballary District- Karnataka-583118
25.	Kendriya Vidyalaya No.1, Angul, Gandhimarg, Angul-759122
26.	Kendriya Vidyalaya Aska, Dhobadi, Po-Kumbhari, Ganjam, Odisha 761111
27.	Kendriya Vidyalaya No-1, Balasore, I.G. Marg, Prof colony, Balasore-756001 (Odisha)
28.	Kendriya Vidyalaya No.2 Balasore Ganeshwarpur, Januganj, Remuna, Balasore, (Odisha) Pin- 756019
29.	Kendriya Vidyalaya Bargarh AT/PO- Bardol Dang Chowk, ACC cement road Dist- Bargarh Pin-768083
30.	Kendriya Vidyalaya Murgabadi, At-Murgabadi, Post-Bhanjpur, Baripada, Dist-Mayurbhanj, Odisha-757002
31.	Kendriya Vidyalaya Bhawanipatna near GOV. ITI Bhawanipatna Kalahandi Odisha-766001
32.	Kendriya Vidyalaya No.3, Bhubaneswar Pragati Vihar conoly,Mancheswar, Bhubaneswar-751017
33.	Kendriya Vidyalaya No.4, Neeladri vihar P.O. Sailashree vihar Bhubaneswar, Dist-Khordha
34.	Kendriya Vidyalaya No.6, Pokhariput, Bhubaneswar, Khordha, Odisha-751020
35.	Kendriya Vidyalaya Boudh, AT- near Revenue coliny, Boudh Po/Dist-Boudh, Pin-762014, Odisha
36.	Kendriya Vidyalaya No.2 Cuttack, Madhupatna, Cuttack, Odisha-753010
37.	Kendriya Vidyalaya Dharamgarh, Vocational College Campus, Dharamgarh Kalahandi, Odiasha-766015
38.	Kendriya Vidyalaya Digapahandi, Ganjam, Odisha-761012
39.	Kendriya Vidyalaya Gajapati At Betaguda Post-Jammi Via-Paralakhemundi Dist-Gajapati Odisha-761201
40.	Kendriya Vidyalaya Gopalpur Military Station At/po:- Golabandha Dist- Ganjam, Odisha, 761052
41.	Kendriya Vidyalaya Hinjilicut, Inside Brundaban Vidyapitha Campus, Ganjam, Odisha-761102
42.	Kendriya Vidyalaya Jagatsinghpur, At: Tarikund High School, Post Office- Tarikund, Dist: Jagat Singpur, Odisha- 754102
43.	Kendriya Vidyalaya Jajpur, At- Akarpada, PO- Sridharpur, Dist- Jajpur, State- Odisha-755062
44.	Kendriya Vidyalaya Kandhamal, At- Mulagudari, PO- Gudari, Via- Khajuripada, Kandhamal, Odisha-762012
45.	Kendriya Vidyalaya NTPC, Kaniha Post- Deepshikha, Dist- Angul, Pin -759147
46.	Kendriya Vidyalaya Barimul, Kendrapara At: Barimul, PO_ Tilottamadeipur, Dist- Kendrapara, Odisha-754250
47.	Kendriya Vidyalaya Keonjhar, PO- Ranki, Keonjhar, Dist- Keonjhar, Odisha-758002
48.	Kendriya Vidyalaya Kutra At Centre Primary School Kutra, Dist- Sundargarh-770018 (Odisha)
49.	Kendriya Vidyalaya Malkangiri, Post+ District- Malkangiri, Odisha-764048
50.	Kendriya Vidyalaya Nabarangpur, Chutiaguda Odisha-764059
51.	Kendriya Vidyalaya Nayagarh (Odisha) At-Muktapur (Near Houshing Board colony),

	Po- Bhatasahi, Via-Nayagarh-2, Pin-752070
52.	Kendriya Vidyalaya Mahuldiha, Rairangpur Mayurbhanj (Odisha)-757043
53.	Kendriya Vidyalaya Rayagada Utkalmaninagar, Jayaramguda, Rayagada, Odisha-765002
54.	Kendriya Vidyalaya Sonepur, Diet Campus, Sonepur, Odisha-767017
55.	Kendriya Vidyalaya Vyasnagar N.C. High School Campus, Po. Jajpur Road, Odisha-755019
56.	Kendriya Vidyalaya Gunupur, Bell Hostel Campus, Old Bank Street, Gunupur, District Rayagada, Pin-765022
57.	Kendriya Vidyalaya Anandpur, 646 M+6F8, Anandpur, Odisha-758021
58.	Kendriya Vidyalaya Chatrapur (Odisha) Onslow Institution Campus, Chatrapur Dist- Ganjam, Pin-761020
59.	Kendriya Vidyalaya Indian Institute of Technology Bhubaneswar, IIT Campus, Argul Jatni, Dist- Khordha, Odisha Pin-752050
60.	Kendriya Vidyalaya MCL Jagannath Area, Central colony, Ghantrpada, Talcher, Angul, Odisha-759116
61.	Kendriya Vidyalaya MCL Subhadra Area, At/Po-South Baland, Talcher, Dist- Angul, Odisha Pin-759116
62.	Kendriya Vidyalaya, Kariar, Raja A.T. High school, M.E. Section, Khariar, Dist- Nuapada (Odisha)-766107

[F. No. 11011/3/2022-OLU]

SYED EKRAM RIZWI, Jt. Secy.

कौशल विकास और उद्यमशीलता मंत्रालय

(प्रशिक्षण महानिदेशालय)

नई दिल्ली, 7 मार्च, 2024

का.आ. 485.—केंद्रीय सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग नियम 1976 (यथा संशोधित 1987) के नियम 10 के उप नियम (2) एवं (4) के अनुसरण में एतद्वारा प्रशिक्षण महानिदेशालय (कौशल विकास और उद्यमशीलता मंत्रालय) के अधीनस्थ कार्यालय राष्ट्रीय कौशल प्रशिक्षण संस्थान, मोहाली को जिसके 80% से अधिक कर्मचारियों ने हिंदी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, अधिसूचित करती है।

[फा. सं. डीजीटी-ई-11012/1/2017-हिंदी]

गुलाब चंद्रा, सहा. निदेशक

MINISTRY OF SKILL DEVELOPMENT AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

(Directorate General of Training)

New Delhi, the 7th March, 2024

S.O. 485.—In Pursuance of sub- rule (2) and (4) rule 10 of the Official Languages (Use of Official Purposes of the Union) Rule 1976 (As Amended 1987), the Central Government hereby notifies National Skill Training Institute, Mohali is subordinate office of Directorate General of Training (Ministry of Skill Development and Entrepreneurship), more than 80% staff whereof have acquired the working knowledge of Hindi.

[F. No.-DGT-E-11012/1/2017-HINDI]

GULAB CHANDRA, Asst. Director

सहकारिता मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 11 मार्च, 2024

का.आ. 486.—बहु-राज्यीय सहकारी समिति अधिनियम, 2002 (2002 का 39) के खंड 4 के उपखंड (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एवं भारत सरकार की अधिसूचना सं. एल-11012/2/2003-एल एवं एम दिनांक 16 फरवरी, 2024 के अधिक्रमण में, केन्द्र सरकार एतद्वारा, श्री आनंद कुमार झा, भारतीय वन सेवा (आंध्र प्रदेश: 1992), संयुक्त सचिव (सहकारिता) को सहकारिता मंत्रालय, भारत सरकार में तत्काल प्रभाव से एवं अगले आदेशों तक सहकारी समितियों के केन्द्रीय पंजीयक के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[फा. सं. एल-11012/2/2003-एल एवं एम]

अमित कुमार रावत, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF COOPERATION

New Delhi, the 11th March, 2024

S.O. 486.—In exercise of the powers conferred under sub-section (1) of Section 4 of the Multi-State Cooperative Societies Act, 2002 (39 of 2002) and in supersession of the Government of India Notification No. L-11012/2/2003-L&M dated 16.02.2024, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Anand Kumar Jha, IFoS (AP:1992), Joint Secretary (Cooperation) in the Ministry of Cooperation, Government of India as the Central Registrar of Cooperative Societies with immediate effect and until further orders.

[F.No. L-11012/2/2003-L&M]

AMIT KUMAR RAWAT, Under Secy.

पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 23 फरवरी, 2024

का.आ. 487.—जबकि भारत सरकार को लोकहित में यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि मेघालय राज्य में नार्थ-ईस्ट नेचुरल गैस पाइपलाइन ग्रिड परियोजना के गुवाहाटी-शिलांग-सिलचर-पानीसागर खंड के माध्यम से प्राकृतिक गैस के परिवहन के लिए मैसर्स इंद्रधनुष गैस ग्रिड लिमिटेड द्वारा एक पाइपलाइन बिछाई जानी चाहिए;

और भारत सरकार को उक्त पाइप लाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि उस भूमि में, जिसमें उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने का प्रस्ताव है और जो इस अधिसूचना में संलग्न अनुसूची में वर्णित है, उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए;

अतः अब, भारत सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइप लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उस भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है;

कोई व्यक्ति, जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है, उस तारीख से जिसको उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत के राजपत्र में यथा प्रकाशित इस अधिसूचना की प्रतियों साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध कर दी जाती है, 21 दिन के भीतर, भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने के संबंध में, सक्षम प्राधिकारी, मैसर्स इंद्रधनुष गैस ग्रिड लिमिटेड, मेघालय राज्य, को लिखित रूप में आक्षेप भेज सकेगा।

अनुसूची

सी एंड आर डी ब्लॉक: खलीहरियात		जिला: - पूर्वी जयंतिया हिल्स	राज्य:- मेघालय		
सीरिल संख्या.	गांव का नाम	सर्वे संख्या	क्षेत्र		
			हेक्टेयर	आर	वर्ग मीटर
1	2	3	4	5	6
1	डिंचिन्नम	नाला	00	08	68
2		सी 26/001- ए	00	71	25
3		सी 26/001- बी	00	10	52
4		सी 26/001- सी	00	74	25
5		सी 26/001- डी	00	85	25
6		सी 26/001- इ	00	74	58
7		सी 26/001- एफ	00	74	19
8		सी 26/001- जी	00	71	48
9		सी 26/001- एच	00	45	85
10		सी 26/001- ऐ	00	65	20
11		सी 26/001- जे	00	64	07
12	खलीहरियात पूर्व	नदी	00	04	00
13		सी 41-01- ए	00	19	60
14		सी 41-01- बी	00	11	90
15		सी 41-01- सी	00	67	95
16		सी 41-02- ए	00	78	60
17		सी 41-02- बी	00	10	00
18		नदी	00	02	00
19	रिंबाई	सी 37-06	00	04	57
20		सी 37-07	00	11	94
21		सी 37-08	00	04	09
22		सी 37-09	00	11	16
23		सी 37-12	00	40	84
24		सी 37-13	00	41	43
25		सी 37-14	00	27	34
26		सी 38-15	00	71	44
27		सी 38-16	00	07	00
28		सी 38-15	00	23	28
29		सी 39-17	00	13	74
30		वाहनाखलीह नदी	00	01	27
31		सी 39-18	00	27	90

32		नदी	00	00	01
33		सी 39-19	00	15	88
34		सी 39-20	00	18	63
35		सी 39-21	00	02	80
36		सी 39-21	00	00	11
37		सी 39-22	00	36	23
38		सी 39-23	00	34	14
39		सी 40-24	00	18	12
40		सी 40-25	00	01	26
41		नदी	00	00	97
42		सी 40-26	00	26	38
43		सी 40-27	00	29	35
44		सी 40-28	00	10	82
45		नाला	00	03	34
46		सी 40-28	00	05	34
47		सी 40-29	00	02	68
48		सी 40-30	00	10	24
49	बापुंग स्कूर	सी 30-042	00	06	56
50		सी 30-043	00	05	94
51		सी 30-044	00	06	40
52		सी 30सी -044	00	00	92
53		सी 30सी -045	00	21	86
54		सी 30सी -046	00	01	19
55		सी 30सी -047(कार्ट ट्रैक)	00	00	80
56		सी 30सी -048	00	14	18
57		सी 30सी -049	00	22	54
58		सी 30सी -050	00	22	67
59		सी 30सी -051	00	33	32
60		सी 30सी -052-ए	00	40	02
61		सी 30सी -052-बी	00	25	00
62		सी 30सी -052- सी	00	19	65
63		सी 30सी -052-डी	00	18	35

[फा. सं. एल-14014/17/2023-जीपी-II(ई-47006)]

रामजीलाल मीना, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM AND NATURAL GAS

New Delhi, the 23rd February, 2024

S.O. 487.—Whereas it appears to the Government of India that it is necessary in public interest that for transportation of natural gas through Guwahati – Shillong – Silchar-Panisagar Section of North - East Natural Gas Pipeline Grid Project in the State of Meghalaya, a pipeline should be laid by M/s Indradhanush Gas Grid Limited;

And, whereas it appears to Government of India that for the purpose of laying the said pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the Right of User in the land under which the said pipeline is proposed to be laid and which is described in the Schedule annexed to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962, (50 of 1962) Government of India hereby declares its intention to acquire the Right of User therein;

Any person interested in the land described in the said Schedule may, within twenty-one days from the date of which the copies of the notification issued under sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the said Act, as published in the Gazette of India are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of the right of User therein for laying of the pipeline under the land to Competent Authority, M/s Indradhanush Gas Grid Limited, State of Meghalaya.

SCHEDULE					
C & R D Block: Khliehriat		District: - East Jaintia Hills	State: - Meghalaya		
Sl. No.	Name of the Village	Survey No.	Area		
			Hectare	Are	Sq.mtr.
1	2	3	4	5	6
1	Deinshynrum	NALA	00	08	68
2		C26/001-A	00	71	25
3		C26/001-B	00	10	52
4		C26/001-C	00	74	25
5		C26/001-D	00	85	25
6		C26/001-E	00	74	58
7		C26/001-F	00	74	19
8		C26/001-G	00	71	48
9		C26/001-H	00	45	85
10		C26/001-I	00	65	20
11		C26/001-J	00	64	07
12	Khliehriat East	River	00	04	00
13		C41-01-A	00	19	60
14		C41-01-B	00	11	90
15		C41-01-C	00	67	95
16		C41-02-A	00	78	60
17		C41-02-B	00	10	00
18		RIVER	00	02	00
19	Rymbai	C37-06	00	04	57
20		C37-07	00	11	94
21		C37-08	00	04	09
22		C37-09	00	11	16
23		C37-12	00	40	84
24		C37-13	00	41	43
25		C37-14	00	27	34
26		C38-15	00	71	44
27		C38-16	00	07	00
28		C38-15	00	23	28
29		C39-17	00	13	74
30		WAHNAKHLIEH RIVER	00	01	27
31		C39-18	00	27	90
32		RIVER	00	00	01
33		C39-19	00	15	88
34		C39-20	00	18	63
35		C39-21	00	02	80

36		C39-21	00	00	11
37		C39-22	00	36	23
38		C39-23	00	34	14
39		C40-24	00	18	12
40		C40-25	00	01	26
41		RIVER	00	00	97
42		C40-26	00	26	38
43		C40-27	00	29	35
44		C40-28	00	10	82
45		NALA	00	03	34
46		C40-28	00	05	34
47		C40-29	00	02	68
48		C40-30	00	10	24
49		C30-042	00	06	56
50		C30-043	00	05	94
51		C30-044	00	06	40
52		C30C-044	00	00	92
53		C30C-045	00	21	86
54		C30C-046	00	01	19
55		C30C-047(CART TRACK)	00	00	80
56	Wapung Skur	C30C-048	00	14	18
57		C30C-049	00	22	54
58		C30C-050	00	22	67
59		C30C-051	00	33	32
60		C30C-052-A	00	40	02
61		C30C-052-B	00	25	00
62		C30C-052-C	00	19	65
63		C30C-052-D	00	18	35

[F. No. L-14014/17/2023-GP-II(E-47006)]

RAMJI LAL MEENA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 23 फरवरी, 2024

का.आ. 488.—जबकि भारत सरकार को लोकहित में यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि असम राज्य में नार्थ-ईस्ट नेचुरल गैस पाइपलाइन ग्रिड परियोजना के गुवाहाटी-नुमालीगढ़-दीमापुर खंड के माध्यम से प्राकृतिक गैस के परिवहन के लिए मैसर्स इंद्रधनुष गैस ग्रिड लिमिटेड द्वारा एक पाइपलाइन बिछाई जानी चाहिए;

और भारत सरकार को उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि उस भूमि में, जिसमें उक्त पाइप लाइन बिछाए जाने का प्रस्ताव है और जो इस अधिसूचना में संलग्न अनुसूची में वर्णित है, उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए;

अतः अब, भारत सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उस भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है;

कोई व्यक्ति, जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है, उस तारीख से जिसको उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत के राजपत्र में यथा प्रकाशित इस अधिसूचना की प्रतियां साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध कर दी जाती है, 21 दिन के भीतर, भूमि के नीचे पाइप लाइन बिछाए जाने के संबंध में, सक्षम प्राधिकारी, मैसर्स इंद्रधनुष गैस ग्रिड लिमिटेड, असम राज्य, को लिखित रूप में आक्षेप भेज सकेगा।

अनुसूची

जिला : दरांग				राज्य : असम		
सर्कल	मौज़ा	गाँव	दाग नं	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेअर	आर	वर्ग मीटर
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
मंगलदै	दाही	झरगांव	882	00	01	32

[फा. सं. एल-14014/2/2024-जीपी-II(ई-48834)]

रामजीलाल मीना, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 23rd February, 2024

S.O. 488.—Whereas it appears to the Government of India that it is necessary in public interest that for transportation of natural gas through Guwahati–Numaligarh–Dimapur Section of North-East Natural Gas Pipeline Grid Project in the State of Assam, a pipeline should be laid by M/s Indradhanush Gas Grid Limited;

And, whereas it appears to Government of India that for the purpose of laying the said pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the Right of User in the land under which the said pipeline is proposed to be laid and which is described in the Schedule annexed to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962, (50 of 1962) Government of India hereby declares its intention to acquire the Right of User therein;

Any person interested in the land described in the said Schedule may, within twenty one days from the date of which the copies of the notification issued under sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the said Act, as published in the Gazette of India are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of the right of User therein for laying of the pipeline under the land to Competent Authority, M/s Indradhanush Gas Grid Limited, State of Assam.

SCHEDULE

District :Darrang				State: Assam		
Circle	Mauza	Village	Dag No.	Area		
				Hec.	Arc	Sq.Mtr.
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Mangaldai	Dahi	Jhargaoon	882	00	01	32

[F. No. L-14014/2/2024-GP-II(E-48834)]

RAMJI LAL MEENA, Under Secy.

श्रम और रोजगार मंत्रालय

(हिन्दी अनुभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 1 नवंबर 2023

का.आ. 489.—केंद्र सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 (यथा संशोधित, 1987) के नियम 10 के उप-नियम (4) के अनुसरण में, श्रम और रोजगार मंत्रालय के प्रशासकीय नियंत्रणाधीन निम्नलिखित कार्यालयों को, जिनके 80 प्रतिशत से अधिक कर्मचारियों ने हिन्दी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करती है:

1. कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम, शाखा कार्यालय, लाल दरवाजा
2. कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम, शाखा कार्यालय, सलाबतपुरा
3. कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम अस्पताल, बद्दी, हिमाचल प्रदेश
4. कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम अस्पताल, लुधियाना, पंजाब
5. कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम, उप क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय, वडोदरा, गुजरात
6. कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय, विजयवाड़ा

[सं. ई-11016/1/2022-रा.भा.नी.]

नागेश कुमार सिंह, उप महानिदेशक

MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT**(Hindi Section)**

New Delhi, the 1st November, 2023

S.O. 489.—In pursuance of Sub-Rule (4) of Rule 10 of the Official Language (Use for official purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976 (as amended, 1987) the Central Government hereby notifies the following offices under the administrative control of the Ministry of Labour & Employment, more than 80% Staff whereof have acquired working knowledge of Hindi:-

1. Employees' State Insurance Corporation, Branch Office, Lal Darwaza
2. Employees' State Insurance Corporation, Branch Office, Salabatpura
3. Employees' State Insurance Corporation Hospital, Baddi, Himachal Pradesh
4. Employees' State Insurance Corporation Hospital, Ludhiana, Punjab
5. Employees' State Insurance Corporation, Sub-Regional Office, Vadodara, Gujarat
6. Employees' State Insurance Corporation, Regional Office, Vijayawada

[No. E-11016/1/2022-RBN]

NAGESH KUMAR SINGH, Dy. Director General

नई दिल्ली, 1 नवंबर 2023

का.आ. 490.—केंद्र सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 (यथा संशोधित, 1987) के नियम 10 के उप-नियम (4) के अनुसरण में, श्रम और रोजगार मंत्रालय के प्रशासकीय नियंत्रणाधीन निम्नलिखित कार्यालयों को, जिनके 80 प्रतिशत से अधिक कर्मचारियों ने हिन्दी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करती है:

1. कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम अस्पताल, लखनऊ
2. कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम आदर्श अस्पताल, फुलवारी शरीफ, पटना
3. कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम आदर्श अस्पताल, बापुनगर, अहमदाबाद
4. कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम अस्पताल, रुद्रपुर

[सं. ई-11016/1/2022-रा.भा.नी.]

नागेश कुमार सिंह, उप महानिदेशक

New Delhi, the 1st November, 2023

S.O. 490.—In pursuance of Sub-Rule (4) of Rule 10 of the Official Language (Use for official purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976 (as amended, 1987) the Central Government hereby notifies the following offices under the administrative control of the Ministry of Labour & Employment, more than 80% Staff whereof have acquired working knowledge of Hindi:-

1. Employees' State Insurance Corporation Hospital, Lucknow
2. Employees' State Insurance Corporation Model Hospital, Phulwari Sharif, Patna
3. Employees' State Insurance Corporation Model Hospital, Bapunagar, Ahmedabad
4. Employees' State Insurance Corporation Hospital, Rudrapur

[No. E-11016/1/2022-RBN]

NAGESH KUMAR SINGH, Dy. Director General

नई दिल्ली, 1 नवंबर 2023

का.आ. 491.—केंद्र सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 (यथा संशोधित, 1987) के नियम 10 के उप-नियम (4) के अनुसरण में, श्रम और रोजगार मंत्रालय के प्रशासकीय नियंत्रणाधीन निम्नलिखित कार्यालयों को, जिनके 80 प्रतिशत से अधिक कर्मचारियों ने हिन्दी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करती है:

1. कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि संगठन, आंचलिक कार्यालय, कानपुर (उत्तर प्रदेश)
2. कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि संगठन, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय, दिल्ली (पश्चिम)
3. कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि संगठन, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय, दिल्ली (मध्य)
4. कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि संगठन, आंचलिक कार्यालय, हरियाणा
5. कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि संगठन, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय, वटवा, गुजरात
6. कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि संगठन, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय, वरंगल, तेलंगाना
7. कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि संगठन, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय, निज़ामाबाद, तेलंगाना

[सं. ई-11016/1/2022-रा.भा.नी.]

नागेश कुमार सिंह, उप महानिदेशक

New Delhi, the 1st November, 2023

S.O. 491.—In pursuance of Sub-Rule (4) of Rule 10 of the Official Language (Use for official purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976 (as amended, 1987) the Central Government hereby notifies the following offices under the administrative control of the Ministry of Labour & Employment, more than 80% Staff whereof have acquired working knowledge of Hindi:-

1. Employees' State Insurance Corporation, Zonal Office, Kanpur (Uttar Pradesh)
2. Employees' State Insurance Corporation, Regional Office, Delhi (West)
3. Employees' State Insurance Corporation, Regional Office, Delhi (Central)
4. Employees' State Insurance Corporation, Zonal Office, Haryana
5. Employees' State Insurance Corporation, Regional Office, Vatva, Gujarat
6. Employees' State Insurance Corporation, Regional Office, Warangal, Telangana
7. Employees' State Insurance Corporation, Regional Office, Nizamabad, Telangana

[No. E-11016/1/2022-RBN]

NAGESH KUMAR SINGH, Dy. Director General

नई दिल्ली, 1 नवंबर 2023

का.आ. 492.—केंद्र सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 (यथा संशोधित, 1987) के नियम 10 के उप-नियम (4) के अनुसरण में, श्रम और रोजगार मंत्रालय के प्रशासकीय नियंत्रणाधीन निम्नलिखित कार्यालयों को, जिनके 80 प्रतिशत से अधिक कर्मचारियों ने हिन्दी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करती है:

1. उप मुख्य श्रमायुक्त (कें.) कार्यालय, देहरादून
2. क्षेत्रीय श्रमायुक्त (कें.) कार्यालय, नोएडा
3. सहायक श्रमायुक्त (कें.) कार्यालय, बरेली
4. राष्ट्रीय करियर सर्विस संस्थान (एनआईसीएस), नोएडा

[सं. ई-11016/1/2022-रा.भा.नी.]

नागेश कुमार सिंह, उप महानिदेशक

New Delhi, the 1st November, 2023

S.O. 492.—In pursuance of Sub-Rule (4) of Rule 10 of the Official Language (Use for official purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976 (as amended, 1987) the Central Government hereby notifies the following offices under the administrative control of the Ministry of Labour & Employment, more than 80% Staff whereof have acquired working knowledge of Hindi:-

1. Office of Deputy Chief Labour Commissioner (C), Dehradun
2. Office of Regional Labour Commissioner (C), Noida
3. Office of Assistant Labour Commissioner (C), Bareilly
4. National Institute for Career Service (NICS), Noida

[No. E-11016/1/2022-RBN]

NAGESH KUMAR SINGH, Dy. Director General

नई दिल्ली, 5 मार्च, 2024

का.आ. 493.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार **पश्चिम रेलवे** के प्रबंधन, संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, **अहमदाबाद** के पंचाट (1049/2004) प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल-41012/42/96- आई आर (बी-1)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 5th March, 2023

S.O. 493.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref.1049/2004) of the *Cent.Govt.Indus.Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Ahmedabad* as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of Western Railway and their workmen.

[No. L-41012/42/96- IR(B.I)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT,
AHMEDABAD**

Present....

Sunil Kumar Singh-I,

Presiding Officer,

CGIT cum Labour Court,
Ahmedabad,
Dated : 01.12.2023

Reference: (CGITA) No- 1049/2004

1. The Divisional Railway Manager, W. Rly.,
Divisional Office, Ajmer Division,
Ajmer(Rajasthan).
2. The Divisional Railway Manager,
Western Railway,
Ahmedabad.

.....First Party

V

The General Secretary,
Western Railway Kamdar Sangh,
T.B.Z.-17, Gurunagar,
Gandhidham(Kutch)

.....Second Party

For the First Party : Shri R. K. Sharma & Shri H. R. Raval
For the Second Party : None

AWARD

The Government of India/Ministry of Labour, New Delhi by reference adjudication Order No. L-41012/42/96-IR(B.I) dated 25.04.97 referred the dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Rajkot (Gujarat) in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule. The matter was received by transfer on creation of this Tribunal at Ahmedabad in the year 2004.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the demand of the Western Railway Kamdar Sangh against the Divisional Railway Manager, Western Railway, Ajmer that the punishment imposed upon Shri Ranveer Singh Asstt. Driver under LF (D) Gandhidham is wrong and illegal and he should be paid his due wages and running allowances for the period of idleness and the punishment imposed be cancelled, valid, just and legal? If so to what benefits the workman is entitled for and what directions are necessary in the matter?”

1. The case was called out. FP/employer Western Railway, Ajmer and Western Railway, Ahmedabad are represented through Ld. Counsels Shri R. K. Sharma and Shri H. R. Raval respectively. None responds for SP/workman's union. Perusal of record shows that the case is fixed for arguments. However it transpires from the perusal of record that the SP/workman has been absenting since 23.07.2020. The second party/workman was afforded last opportunity on 29.11.2022 along with additional opportunities on 02.03.2023 and 03.08.2023. It appears that the SP/workman has either settled his dispute with the FP/employer out of court or is not interested to proceed further in the matter. Thus, in the circumstances, the claim of the workman is declined and the reference is answered in positive in favour of the FP/employer and against the SP/workman. The award is passed accordingly.

Let two copies of the Award be sent to the Appropriate Government for the needful and for publication U/s 17(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

SUNIL KUMAR SINGH-I, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 7 मार्च, 2024

का.आ. 494.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मेसर्स वरिष्ठ महाप्रबंधक, भारतीय आयुध निर्माणी, रायपुर, देहरादून, के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और महासचिव, ऑर्डिनेंस फैक्ट्री मजदूर संघ, रायपुर, देहरादून, के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक

अधिकरण- सह- श्रम न्यायालय-1 चंडीगढ़ पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 81/2018) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 05/03/2024 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-14011/8/2018-आईआर-(डीयू)]

दिलीप कुमार, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 7th March, 2023

S.O. 494.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (**Ref. No. 81/2018**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court –I, Chandigarh**, as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation **The Sr. General Manager, Indian Ordinance Factory, Raipur, Dehradun**, and **The General Secretary, Ordinance Factory Mazdoor Sangh, Raipur, Dehradun**, which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on **05/03/2024**.

[No. L-14011/8/2018- IR (DU)]

DILIP KUMAR, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-I, CHANDIGARH.

Present: Sh. Kamal Kant, Presiding Officer-cum-Link Officer, Chandigarh.

ID No.81/2018

Registered On: 20.11.2018

The General Secretary, Ordinance Factory Mazdoor Sangh, Raipur, Dehradun-248001.

.....Workman

Versus

The Sr. General Manager, Indian Ordinance Factory, Raipur, Dehradun-248001.

.....Management

AWARD

Passed On: 02.02.2024

Central Government vide Notification No. L-14011/8/2018-IR(DU) dated 24.10.2018, under clause (d) of Sub-Section (1) sub-section (2) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter called the Act), has referred the following Industrial dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal:-

“Whether the action of management of Ordinance Factory Raipur, Dehradun can be considered harassment to a registered union represented by Sh. Subash Chand Chauhan, General Secretary Ordinance Factory Mazdoor Sangh, Raipur in the barb of maintaining discipline and taking disciplinary against its office bearers? Whether it amounts to unfair labour practice? If so, what relief can be given to union/union office bearers?”

1. During the pendency of the proceedings before this Tribunal the case was fixed for filing evidence by way of affidavit by Management. On perusal of the file it shows that AR for Union has withdrawn his authority as per order dated 11.05.2023. The case was adjourned to 25.08.2023.
2. Notice was given to the Secretary of the Union. The Secretary of the Union informed telephonically that he would not appear on 25.08.2023 as he is ill. Thereafter none appear on behalf of Union on 25.08.2023. Today also nobody appeared on behalf of Union.
3. It appears that the Union is not interested in adjudication of the matter on merits as such, this Tribunal is left with no choice except to pass a ‘No Claim Award’. Accordingly, no claim award is passed in the present case for the non-prosecution of Union. File after completion be consigned in the record room.
4. Let copy of this award be sent to Central Government for publication as required under Section 17 of the ID Act, 1947.

KAMAL KANT, PO-cum-Link Officer

नई दिल्ली, 7 मार्च, 2024

का.आ. 495.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मेसर्स उप. महानिदेशक, कमांडर (पश्चिम बंगाल), एंकरेज कैम्प, हल्दिया, पूर्ब मेदिनीपुर, के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कामगार, के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण-सह-श्रम न्यायालय-कोलकाता पंचाट(संदर्भ संख्या 12 OF 2013) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 07.03.2024 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-14011/10/2012-आईआर(डीयू)]

दिलीप कुमार, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 7th March, 2023

S.O. 495.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. 12 OF 2013) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court – Kolkata** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **The Dy. Director General, Commander (West Bengal), Anchorage Camp, Haldia, Purba Medinipur, and, Their Worker**, which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 07.03.2024.

[No. L-14011/10/2012-IR (DU)]

DILIP KUMAR, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT KOLKATA

Present : Justice K. D. Bhutia, Presiding Officer.

REF. NO. 12 OF 2013

Parties : Employers in relation to the management of

The Dy. Director General, Commander (West Bengal), Coast Guard, Anchorage Camp, Haldia, Purba Medinipur.

AND

Their Workmen

Appearance :

On behalf of the Management: Mr. Abhijit Bhadra, Ld. Advocate.

On behalf of the Union/Workmen: Mr. Banibrata Roy, Ld.

Advocate.

Dated: 27th February, 2024

AWARD

By order No. L-14011/10/2012 –IR(DU) dated 25-02-2013, the Central Government, Ministry of Labour in exercise of power conferred u/s 10 (1) (d) and sub-section (2A) of Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 has referred the following disputes to this Tribunal for adjudication:-

“Whether the action of the management of Commandant Indian Coast Guard DHQ-8, Haldia Port in terminating the service of five number of workmen w.e.f. 07-04-2010, namely Sri Bidhan Chandan Mondal, Sri Sambhu Manna, Sri Bimal Modanl, Sri Raj Kumar Das and Sri Tutai Das (whose name deleted vide order dated 03-01-2024) is legal or justified? If not, what relief the workmen are entitled to?”

It is the case of the workmen that they were engaged as Casual Labours by the authority of Indian Coast Guard, Anchorage Camp, Haldia on the basis of an interview called for appointment of unskilled casual labours. The workmen Sri Bidhan Chandan Mondal joined as casual labour on 11-12-2002, Sri Sambhu Manna joined in the year 2004, Sri Bimal Mondal joined on 07-10-2005 and Sri Raj Kumar Das joined on 20-10-2005,

It is their case that they were made to work 26 days in a month, but payment was made only for 16 days. On this issue they have made a representation before the A.L.C. (Central) and as such they were prevented from joining

their duty as unskilled casual labour w.e.f. 07-04-2010. That being aggrieved by their illegal such illegal termination they filed an application being No. O.A. No.1203 of 2010 before the Central Administrative Tribunal and the Tribunal disposed of the said O.A. on 14-06-2010 with a direction to submit representation before the authority of Coast Guard and who was directed to dispose of the representation within four months.

Accordingly, the workmen submitted a representation before the Commander, Coast Guard District Head Quarter, No. 8, Anchorage Camp, Medinipore on 12-07-2010 for their re-engagement but their application was rejected by the authority of Coast Guard on 27-08-2010.

On rejection of their representation by the authority of Coast Guard they moved the Regional Labour Commissioner-Central on 13-07-2011 for reinstatement. The conciliation failed before the A.L.C (Central) and on receiving the failure report by the Ministry their dispute has been referred to this Tribunal for adjudication. They in their claim statement have prayed for reinstatement with full back wages and with consequential benefits.

Such case and claim of those workmen have been contested by the authorities of the Coast Guard by filing written objection, where it has alleged that Coast Guard is not an 'industry' as defined in section 2(j) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and therefore, the present Tribunal lacks jurisdiction.

However, it has admitted that Coast Guard had engaged unskilled casual labours on daily basis as per work requirement for a period not exceeding 16 days in a month during the period from 2002 to 2005. That as per policy of employment daily wage casual labours were required to register their names in local Employment Exchange. On receipt of their names from Employment Exchange informal interview was taken. At the time of engagement it was clearly explained to those casual labours that their service would be taken as per the work requirement for a maximum period of 16 days in a month. That they would be paid wages as per State Govt. rates as amended from time to time. Wages were paid to those casual labours through CG Budgetary allocation and not from salary head. Entry Gate Pass were issued to those labours for entry in all Coast Guard premises at Haldia being a defence organisation and where a high degree of discipline is always maintained. It was found that those unskilled casual labours tried to instigate and misguide other unskilled casual labours and provoked them not to work with Coast Guard. Therefore, the service of those five undisciplined casual labours were called off.

Challenging the action of the authorities of Coast Guard those five workmen moved Central Administrative Tribunal and where they could not succeed. Then they moved Asst. Labour Commissioner-Central and which has no authority to decide the matter of those casual workmen. Thus, they have alleged the present reference case is not maintainable and those casual labours are not entitled to get reliefs as claimed and prayed for dismissal of the reference.

Record shows on behalf of those five workmen Sri Bidhan Chandan Mondal has deposed as W.W.No.1. As per order sheet dated 29-04-2015, nine documents filed by them have been marked as Exhibit-W-1 to W-9 on formal proof being dispensed with.

On the other hand the management has examined its Section Officer Sri Alok Roy as M.W. No.1. Management has also filed evidence in chief on affidavit of one Smt. Soma Karmakar, another Section Officer, but whom it has failed to produce and examine. The management has failed to produce any document in its defence.

It is admitted fact that those five workmen, at present four, were engaged by Coast Guard as daily casual labours to work at its establishment at Anchorage Camp, Haldia, Medinipur. They were engaged during the period from 2002 to 2005. That Coast Guard have stopped taking their services as daily casual labours with effect from 07-04-2010. Then, those five workmen moved Central Administrative Tribunal challenging the action of the Coast Guard, denying them the job of casual daily labours w.e.f. 07-04-2010. They did not get any relief from Central Administrative Tribunal, rather they were directed to submit a comprehensive representation before the authority of Coast Guard. When their representation was rejected, then they moved the Labour Commissioner- Central for redressal of their grievances.

Since the authority of Coast Guard has challenged the jurisdiction of this Tribunal to adjudicate the dispute under reference, so let me first decide the issue whether Indian Coast Guard is an 'industry' as defined in section 2(j) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947?

The terms "industry" is defined in section 2(j) of the I.D. Act, and it read as follows:-

'Industry' means any business, trade, undertaking, manufacture or calling of employers and includes any calling, service, employment, handicraft, or industrial occupation or avocation of workmen.

It is true there is an amendment in the definition of the term "industry" in section 2(j) of the I.D. Act, 1947 through amending Act in 1982, in view of the decision in Bangalore Water Supply & Sewerage -vs- A. Rajappa & Ors. (Supra) but the said amendment has not been given effect till date by notifying the same by the Govt. Consequently, the term "industry" that has been interpreted by Hon'ble Supreme Court in Bangalore Water Supply

&Sewerage –vs- A. Rajappa &Ors., prevails. More so, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Coir Board, Ernakula –vs- Indira Debi (Supra) has been pleased to hold that the judgment of Bangalore Water Supply needs no reconsideration.

The Hon'ble Supreme Court in Bangalore Water Supply & Sewerage –vs- A. Rajappa & Ors. has given liberal interpretation to the word “industry” and held-

1. Any activity will be industry if it fulfils the “triple test”, as under:

- (i) Systematic and organized activity
- (ii) With the cooperation between employer and employee
- (iii) For the production and distribution of goods and services whether or not capital has been invested for this activity.

2. It is immaterial whether or not there is profit motive or whether or not there is capital.

3. If the organisation is a trade or business it does not cease to be one because of philanthropy animating the triple test, cannot be exempted from scope of definition of “industry”.

4. Dominant nature test – whether there is complex activities, the test would be predominant nature of services and integrated nature of departments. All departments integrated with industry will also be industry.

5. The exceptions to industry are –

- (a) Casual activities (because they are not systematic).
- (b) Small clubs, co-operatives, research Labs, Gurukuls which have an essentially non-employee character.
- (c) Single door lawyer taking help from clerk (because there is no organised labour).
- (d) Selfless charitable activities carried on through volunteers' e.g. free legal or medical service.
- (e) Sovereign functions – strictly understood i.e. maintenance of law and order, legislative functions and judicial functions.

Further, Hon'ble Supreme Court and different Hon'ble High Courts has interpreted the term “industry” as follow:-

The Hon'ble Supreme Court in All India Institute of Medical Science (Supra), held that AIIMS, an autonomous Govt. Public Medical University under the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Govt. of India to be an ‘industry’.

Whether Agriculture Produce Market Committee established under the Karnataka Agricultural Produce Marketing (Regulation) Act, 1966 is an industry or not has come up for consideration before the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Agricultural Produce Market Committee –vs- Ashok Harikuni & Anrs (Supra) and held that the dominant function of the committee is to regulate and control trading of agriculture produce. The functions discharged or undertaken by the committee and its functionaries could be taken by private persons and therefore, the function of the committee cannot be termed as sovereign function. Hon'ble Supreme Court has further discussed what is sovereign and held “sovereign function in the new sense may have very wide ramification but essentially sovereign functions which only State could exercise. Thus, various functions of the State, may be ramifications of ‘sovereignty’ but they all cannot be construed as primary inalienable functions. Broadly it is taxation, eminent domain and police power which covers its field. It may cover its legislative functions, administration of law, eminent domain, maintenance of law and order, internal and external security, grant of pardon. So, the dichotomy between sovereign and non-sovereign function could be found by finding which of the functions of the State could be undertaken by any private person or body. The one which could be undertaken by private person or body cannot be sovereign function. In a given case even in subject on which the State has the monopoly may also be non-sovereign in nature. Mere dealing in subject of monopoly of the State would not make any such enterprise sovereign in nature. Absence of profit making or mere quid pro also not make such enterprise to be outside the ambit of “industry” as also in case of Bombay Hospital Mazdoor Sabha case (AIR 1960 SC 610)”.

In Des Raj (Supra) the Hon'ble Supreme Court held Irrigation Deptt. and P.W.D. are “industry” though functions of the Irrigation Deptt. are essentially govt. functions and that those functions neither partake the nature of the trade and business nor are even remotely analogous thereto. The state govt. through Irrigation Deptt. render services in the matter of supply water by constructing canals and dams and therefore, such services does not fall between the ambits of the sovereign or regal function of the State. The service by the Irrigation Deptt. to the people at large comes within the definition of ‘industry’.

The Hon'ble Supreme Court in Chief Conservator of Forest & Industry & Anrs. (Supra) held that the Social Forestry Work scheme undertaken by the Forest Department for conservation of forests and environment cannot be

regarded as sovereign function as such scheme could be done by private individual or entity and thereby held that Forest Department as an 'industry'.

The Hon'ble High Court of Gujarat in P.W.D. Employees' Union & Ors. (Supra) held "merely because the legislative power in respect of National Highways or for that matter State Highways is left to the Union or the State Govt., it cannot be said that it would become such a function that it can be treated as sovereign function as strictly understood. It cannot be claimed to be a function akin to the legislative or judicial function or one akin to the defence of the state or nation. The construction of dams and allied activities is welfare activity or economic adventure undertaken by the Govt. as contra-distinguished from sovereign function strict sensu".

In R. Srinivas Rao (Supra), the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh held that "objects and functions of National Remote Sensing Agency, that it has systematic activity or organisation with co-operation, between it and its employees, for the production and distribution of material services calculated to satisfy human wants and wishes. Of its functions, the more important ones to be noted are those relating to consultancy services or survey facilities, carrying out of surveys by using remote sensing technology for locating various natural resources, agriculture, hydrology, meteorology, fisheries, minerals, oils, soils, environmental monitoring, forestry, ocean resources, topography, land resources and crop disease surveillance and the distribution of the material to institutions and persons. I have, therefore, no hesitation to hold that the National Remote Sensing Agency satisfies the test laid down by the Supreme Court and that it is an 'industry' u/s 2(j) of the I.D. Act."

Further, held "sovereign functions are to be restricted to administration of justice and maintenance of order and prevention of crime or otherwise legislative powers, administration of laws and exercise of judicial power and inasmuch as activities of National Remote Sensing Agency do not come under these categories, it must be held that N.R.S.A. is an industry falling u/s 2(j)."

In Ram Prasad (Supra) the Hon'ble High Court of Rajasthan held that State Insurance and Provident Fund Deptt. of Rajasthan is an industry.

In State of U. P. (Supra) the Hon'ble High Court of Allahabad held that Irrigation Department of the State of U.P. to be an 'industry'.

In Raju Kumar Saha (Supra), the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi held that Office of the Controller General of Patents, Designs and Trade Mark to be an industry and its function could not be treated as inalienably sovereign, or akin to functions of taxation, eminent domain, legislative functions, administration and maintenance of law and order, internal and external security and police pardon. It could not be regarded as core sovereign functions which, were constitutionally incapable of delegation.

In Union of India & Anrs. (Supra) the Hon'ble High Court of Calcutta held that apparently Farakka Barrage Project by virtue of an agreement distribute Ganges water between India and Bangladesh can be said to be sovereign function, but other functions of the Barrage cannot by any stretch of imagination be described as sovereign functions and thereby held the Barrage to be an 'industry'.

Thus, from the above decisions it appears all kinds of organised activities giving rise to employee and employer relationship and all kinds of systematic organised activities undertaken by the State are covered by wide definition of 'industry' except those activities of State or Govt. Departments which are regal and sovereign in nature or inalienable functions of the State like law and order, defence, legislative and judiciary which are sovereign functions. What is approved to be "Sovereign" is defence of the country, raising armed forces, making peace or war, foreign affairs, power to acquire and retain territory. These are not amenable to the jurisdiction of ordinary civil courts. The other functions of the State including welfare activity of State could not be construed as "sovereign" exercise of power. Hence, every governmental function need not be "sovereign". State activities are multifarious. From the primal sovereign power, which exclusively inalienably could be exercised by the Sovereign alone, which is not subject to challenge in any civil court to all the welfare activities, which would be undertaken by any private person. One of the tests to determine if the legislative or executive function is sovereign in nature is whether the State is answerable for such actions in courts of law. For instance, acts such as defence of the country, raising armed forces and maintaining it, making peace or war, foreign affairs, power to acquire and retain territory, are functions which are indicative of external sovereignty and are political in nature. Therefore, they are not amenable to jurisdiction of ordinary civil court.

It is a matter of common knowledge that Indian Coast Guard (ICG) is a maritime law enforcement and search and rescue agency of India with jurisdiction over its territorial waters including its contiguous zone and exclusive economic zone. The Coast Guard works in close cooperation with the Indian Navy, the Department of Fisheries, the Department of Revenue (Customs), and the Central Armed Police Forces, and the State Police Services. The Coast Guard looks after the territorial water and regularly patrol and does surveillance to protect the nation. It works jointly with Indian Navy, Customs Department and State Police. It is responsible for search and rescue, enforcement of maritime law, safety of vessels, maintain of sea mariners and border control. During war time it plays a role of Naval Reserve Force with responsibility in harbours, defence port securities, naval

intelligence and coast petrol. It is a wing of Indian Defence. Therefore, the functions which is discharged by Coast Guard, an Armed Force Unit is in sovereign in nature. Such sovereign function cannot be discharged by a private individual. Therefore, the functions discharge by Coast Guard cannot fall within the definition of 'industry'.

Since the establishment of Coast Guard is not an industry then question of existence of Industrial Disputes between it and its casual labours does not arises. Therefore, this Tribunal lacks jurisdiction to entertain the application filed by the casual labours of Indian Coast Guard.

However, it has been alleged those five workmen were engaged for 26 days in a month by the Coast Guard authority, but payment was made only for 16 days. Nothing has come on record to show to prove and corroborate the fact that those casual labours were engaged for more than 16 days in a month. Thus, it appears those five casual workmen were engaged only for 16 days in a month. In that case those five workmen were engaged for a period of 192 days in a calendar year. For the sake of argument even if we assume that those five workmen were workmen as defined in Industrial Disputes Act and the establishment of Coast Guard is an industry, still those workmen have failed to fulfil the criteria as laid down in section 25-B and 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act.

Moreover, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Uma Devi case has been pleased to hold, there is no fundamental right in those who have been employed on daily wages or temporary or contractual basis, to be a holder of a post. Therefore, they cannot claim reinstatement. When they have joined the services as casual labours they were well aware of the nature of their service. The term 'casual' itself indicates that the nature of job is very temporary and casual and which is not of a permanent in nature.

That apart, the very fact moving Central Administrative Tribunal immediate after termination by those five workmen ipso facto prove that they were well aware the establishment where they were engaged as casual unskilled labours was not an 'industry'.

In view of above the present reference is not maintainable as Indian Coast Guard is held not to be an 'industry' as defined in section 2(j) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. Accordingly, Reference Case No. 12 of 2013 is disposed of being not maintainable and an award to that effect is passed.

Justice K. D. BHUTIA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 7 मार्च, 2024

का.आ. 496.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन, संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, कोल्हापुर नं. 2 के पंचाट (1/2018) प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल-39025/01/2024- आई आर (बी-II)-12]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 7th March, 2024

S.O. 496.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref.1/2018) of the *Indus.Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Kolhapur No. 2*, as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of Bank of India and their workmen.

[No. L-39025/01/2024- IR(B.II)-12]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL COURT NO.02, KOLHAPUR

REFERENCE (I.T.) NO.01/2018.

EXH.O-5

Bank of India,
1519, 'C' Ward, Jaydhawal Building,
Laxmipuri, Kolhapur.
Through Zonal Manager.

.. First Party

V/s.

Shri. Rohit Sambhaji Varekar,

.. Second Party

2596, 'D' Juna Budhwarpeth, Kolhapur.

CORAM :- Shri. S. D. Suryawanshi, Presiding Officer.

J. O. Code :- MH02959.

APPEARANCE :-

For First Party :- Ld. Adv. Shri. R. L. Chavan

For Second Party :- Ld. Adv. Shri. V. S. Chavan

AWARD

(Decided on this 04th day of January, 2024)

1) Present industrial dispute is referred by appropriate Government under Section-10, Sub-Section-1 (d) and Sub-Section-(2A) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication following issues as per schedule,

“Whether the action of Management of Bank of India, Kolhapur Branch in not giving compassionate appointment to Shri. Rohit Sambhaji Verekar is legal and justified ? If not, to what relief the complainant is entitled to”.

Accordingly, notices were served upon the second party and first party to submit their statement-of-claim and written statement. Notice was duly served upon both the parties, thereafter, second party appeared through his Advocate and filed statement-of-claim at Exh.U-03 and submitted his case as follows :

2) The second party has raised present dispute in the capacity of legal heir of late Mr. Sambhaji Varekar who was working on the post of Peon in the first party Bank. Unfortunately, his father was expired on 02/07/2011 leaving behind his wife and three children. After the sad demise of father, her mother was applied with the first party to absorb on compassionate ground as per application dated 02/09/2011. However, during the pendency of said application and decision from the first party Bank, she also expired on 20/05/2016. After the sad demise of his mother, second party has applied with the first party to absorb him on compassionate ground vide application dated 14/06/2016. The first party inspite of receiving his application has not taken any positive steps for absorbing him in the employment. After realising that, the first party is not taking seriously his demand, the second party has sent demand notice to the first party and has made specific demand that, to absorb him in the employment on compassionate ground and to pay compensation whichever is applicable due to death of his father late Shri. Sambhaji Varekar. Even-though the first party has not considered his demand, therefore, he raised dispute with the appropriate Government vide application dated 16/03/2017. The Regional Labour Commissioner has hold conciliation proceedings on various dates. The first party on dated 11/04/2017 submitted its reply before the Regional Labour Commissioner. The reply submitted by first party is false and devoid of any truth. The first party has taken assistance of Circular No.98/2012 dated 15/01/2005 as well as Circular No.101/150 dated 06/11/2007. Prior to death of his father, the scheme dated 06/11/2007 was applicable to the legal heirs. The provision regarding appointment on compassionate basis at Clause No.03 (II) (b) is applicable to the second party but with malafide intention and bad motive taking wrong meaning of this Clause, the first party has decline to give appointment to the second party on compassionate ground. Due to Bank's adamant, vague and evasive defence the conciliation proceedings before Regional Labour Commissioner became futile.

3) The father of second party had joined the employment of erstwhile Bank viz. The Bank of Karad Limited on 01/01/1979. The said Bank was amalgamated with Bank of India later on. The first party had given letter of appointment to his father on dated 02/05/1994. Therefore, considering this aspect circular regarding appointment on compassionate ground for the legal heirs is applicable to the second party. But, to deprive the second party from getting benefit of this Clause, the second party is forbidden from enjoying the benefits of compassionate appointment. The second party is having requisite qualification to appoint as a Sub-Staff as he has passed 12th Standard. His mother and second party himself have made several correspondence with the first party regarding appointment on compassionate ground also she has met on several occasion to the Officers of first party. But, no any correspondence was made by first party. The second party is only bread earner in his family. Therefore, considering his family background as well as eligibility criteria set out by first party, second party is entitled to get recruited on compassionate ground.

4) During the course of employment his father was working on the post of Peon, therefore, he was not having any managerial as well as supervisory powers. Since, the second party is seeking appointment on compassionate ground hence this Tribunal is having jurisdiction to try and entertain present dispute. Being Banking industry, the first

party is having network of Branches all over India. To discharge day to day Banking activities, the first party has appointed numerous persons in the capacity of Officers and Sub-Staff. Therefore, Bank is covered under the definition of 'Industry' under Section-2(j) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The Section Officer as well as appropriate Authority deemed fit to refer the dispute for adjudication and found substance in the dispute between the parties. Therefore, he is entitled to be appointed on compassionate ground as per Circular No.101/150 dated 06/11/2007 and also entitled to consequential and other benefits.

5) The first party Bank has filed its Written Statement at Exh.C-02 and denied all the allegations and prayed to dismiss the reference stating that, the reference is not maintainable in the eyes of law and further second party has no *locus-standi* to file present reference. The alleged cause of action arose for this reference on 02/07/2011 and application was submitted by second party to the Labour Commissioner on 16/03/2017 and as such present reference is not within limitation and it is hopelessly time barred. Therefore, on the count of delay and laches, the present reference deserves to be dismissed in *limini*. The appointment on compassionate ground cannot be claimed as a matter of right by the second party. It is pure discretion of the Management that would be considered on the basis of Rules applicable to the first party Bank.

6) Further it is submitted that, the first party Bank is nationalised Bank which has issued Branch Circular No.101/150 dated 06/11/2007 and framed scheme that "Scheme for payment of Ex-gratia Lumpsum amount in lieu of appointment on compassionate grounds and appointment of dependents of deceased employee on compassionate grounds in exceptional cases". The said scheme is applicable to all the employees working with the first party Bank. The salient features of the scheme are as under :

(I) The scheme for grant of Ex-gratia will be applicable in the following cases of employees :

- (a) Employee dying in harness (other than due to injury while performing official duty as result of violence, terrorism, robbery or dacoity);
- (b) Employee dying due to injury sustained while performing official duty within or outside office premises (other than due violence, terrorism, robbery or dacoity and excluding travel from residence to place of work or back);
- (c) Employee seeking premature retirement due to incapacitation before reaching the age of 55 years.

(II) The scheme of compassionate appointment will be applicable in the following cases of employees :

- (a) Employee dying while performing official duty as a result of violence, terrorism, robbery or dacoity;
- (b) Employee dying within five years of his first appointment of before reaching the age of 30 years, whichever is later, leaving a dependent spouse and / or minor children.

(III) In the eligible cases, Ex-gratia compensation will be payable on compassionate grounds at the rate of 60% of the last drawn gross salary (net of taxes) for each month of remaining service of the deceased / incapacitated employee, subject to cadre-wise ceilings.

7) As far as deceased employee late Shri. Sambhaji Varekar is concerned; he was taken up in the services as a Peon by the erstwhile Bank of Karad Limited w.e.f. 01/01/1979. Thereafter, said Bank of Karad is amalgamated in the first party Bank w.e.f. 01/05/1994 as per the order passed by the Reserve Bank of India. After the amalgamation of the said Karad Bank, the first party issued appointment order on the post of Peon on 27/05/1994. After the amalgamation of said Karad Bank, all the rules and service conditions fixed by first party Bank in respect of its employees are made applicable to the staff of the Karad Bank. Late Mr. Sambhaji Varekar died on 02/07/2011. As per Rule No.3 (II) (b) neither late Mr. Sambhaji Varekar died within five years of his first appointment nor before reaching the age of 30 years, whichever is later, leaving a dependent spouse and / or minor children. Therefore, as per this rule, the second party cannot claim any benefit of compassionate appointment. After the demise of late Mr. Sambhaji Varekar, the following benefits are paid to the nominee and total family income is Rs.14,153.49/- and said income exceeds 60% of the gross salary (net taxes) of the month preceding the month of death. The calculation of family income is as under :

	Details	Amount (in Rs.)
A.	Family Pension per month	8,679
B.	Gratuity (Lumpsum)	4,09,889
C.	PF (Lumpsum)	4,06,136
D.	Leave encashment	1,66,146
E.	Total Loans	2,52,238.50

F.	Net Corpus	7,29,932.50 (B+C+D+E)
G.	Monthly Interest (Maximum TDR interest rate @9.00%)	5474.49 (F*9%)
H.	Total Family Income	14,153.49

Therefore, considering above calculations and amount of benefit flow from the services of late Mr. Sambhaji Varekar, the second party cannot claim any benefit of compassionate appointment.

8) As regards to the Paras 01, 02 and 03 it is submitted that, neither the second party nor his mother was eligible for the appointment on compassionate ground. Therefore, question of considering their applications for the appointment on compassionate ground does not arise at all. The second party as well as his mother were also aware of this fact. Therefore, contentions in the said paras that, “the second party repeatedly made follow-up regarding his application and demand was not taken seriously”, is totally incorrect, self-motivated and baseless. The first party Bank filed detailed reply to the demand notice of second party before Conciliation Officer pointing out all the legal as well as factual positions. Therefore, contentions or allegations in the said paras that, “reply submitted by the first party on dated 11/04/2017 is false and devoid of any truth illegal” is totally false, baseless, misleading and distorted. As far as contentions of Paras 05, 06, 07 and 08 of statement-of-claim is concerned; these contentions are false, baseless, misleading, distorted, outrageous and self-motivated. Entire conduct on the part of second party defies logical and prudent behaviour and it lies ill in his mouth to contend and canvass that, he is eligible for the appointment on compassionate ground. No cause of action arose for the reference, therefore, present reference is deserves to be dismissed and relief claimed by second party may be rejected.

9) On the basis of pleadings of the parties, issues are framed at Exh.O-04. To justify the case of both the parties, the second party filed his affidavit on oath at Exh.U-06 and first party filed affidavit at Exh.C-07. Further both the parties relied on documents produced along-with Exh.C-03, Exh.C-06, Exh.C-09 and Exh.U-08. Finally both the learned Advocates were given sufficient opportunity to argue the matter. The second party and first party relied on authorities of which copies are filed along-with Exh.U-13 and Exh.C-15. On the basis of material placed before this Tribunal and argument advanced by parties, following issues are discussed and necessary findings to that effect recorded as under :

ISSUES

- 1) Whether the reference is maintainable ?
- 2) Does the second party prove that, the action of Management of first party Bank in not giving compassionate appointment to second party is legal and justified ?
- 3) Does the second party prove that, he is entitled to the reliefs claimed ?
- 4) What award ?

FINDINGS

.. In the affirmative.

.. Partly in negative.

.. Partly in the affirmative.

.. As per final order.

REASONS

AS TO ISSUE NO. 01 :-

10) After going through the entire proceeding and submission made by respective parties it is observed that, admittedly Bank is covered by definition of ‘Industry’ defined under Section-2(j) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and also admittedly deceased employee late Mr. Sambhaji Varekar was employed by first party Bank in the capacity of Peon on and from 02/05/1994. Prior to that, he was employed by Bank of Karad Limited. Later on Bank of Karad merged in the first party Bank since 01/05/1994. Admittedly, the first party Bank has given appointment letter dated 02/05/1994, therefore, there was employer - employee relationship between late Mr. Sambhaji Varekar and first party Bank. If perused written statement, first party Bank has admitted that, Bank has issued Circular No.101/150 dated 06/11/2007 framing scheme for payment of ex-gratia lumpsum amount in lieu of appointment on compassionate ground and also appointment to the dependents of deceased employee on compassionate grounds in exceptional cases. No doubt circular dated 06/11/2007 was applicable to the deceased employee on some terms and conditions. Therefore, widow of deceased employee had been made application on dated 02/09/2011 to the first party Bank

requesting compassionate appointment of which copy is filed on record at Exh.U-08 at running Page No.09. But allegedly the Bank has not taken any positive decision for a longer time upto 2016. Thereafter, widow of deceased employee also expired on 20/05/2016. Therefore, second party has made application dated 14/06/2016 requesting to the Bank to appoint him on compassionate ground and pay ex-gratia lumpsum amount in pursuance of Circular No.98/12 dated 15/01/2005 and Circular No.101/150 dated 06/11/2007 of which copy is available at Exh.U-08 at running page No.11. Allegedly again the first party Bank has not taken positive steps with regards to the demand made by second party and also not communicated to the second party that, he is not entitled for compassionate appointment or ex-gratia lumpsum amount as per circular dated 06/11/2007 or 15/01/2005. In the result, he sent demand notice to the Bank and approached to the Conciliation Officer to conciliate the parties with regards to demand made by second party. It appears that, the Conciliation Officer called the first party wherein first party was appeared and strongly opposed to the demand made by second party submitting its reply dated 11/04/2017. However, dispute could not be resolved and resulted into failure report and sent it to the Industrial Tribunal for adjudication as per schedule of reference order.

11) Further if perused the written statement, the first party Bank has objected reference on the ground that, the second party has no *locus-standi* and no cause of action arose on dated 02/07/2011. Further objected that, application submitted by second party to the Labour Commissioner dated 16/03/2017 is not within limitation and it is hopelessly time barred. Therefore, it urged that, on the ground of delay and laches present reference be dismissed in *limini*. Hence, my learned Predecessor has framed issue as to whether reference is maintainable ? Firstly, it is necessary to decide the *locus-standi* of second party and delay caused for raising the dispute.

12) As far as *locus-standi* is concerned; it is admitted fact that, the father of second party was employed by first party Bank in the capacity of Peon on and from 27/05/1994. Before completion of retirement age he expired on 02/07/2011. Admittedly, the first party Bank has issued circular dated 06/11/2007. If perused said circular produced along-with Exh.C-03 it reveals that, the Bank has framed the scheme for grant of ex-gratia lumpsum amount and compassionate appointment to the legal heirs or dependents of the employee. On the basis of said circular, firstly the widow of deceased was applied for appointment on compassionate ground and when she expired second party has applied for the appointment on compassionate ground or ex-gratia lumpsum amount in lieu of compassionate appointment. However, first party Bank has not communicated anything about the demand made by second party, therefore, he raised industrial dispute. Hence, it cannot be said that, he has no *locus-standi* to prefer dispute because his father was employed by first party Bank and circular dated 06/11/2007 clearly suggest that, the legal heirs or dependents are entitled to claim compassionate appointment or ex-gratia lumpsum amount. In pursuance of circular dated 06/11/2007 he made an attempt to claim compassionate appointment or ex-gratia lumpsum amount. But said dispute could not be resolved before the Conciliation Officer, therefore, said reference is referred for adjudication. Hence, first party Bank has no right to say that, the second party has no *locus-standi*.

13) As far as delay caused for raising the dispute is concerned; no doubt admittedly second party was not employed by first party Bank but his father was employed by first party. On the part of first party it was expected to communicate the second party in pursuance of letter dated 02/09/2011 or letter dated 14/06/2016. Not providing employment on compassionate ground and not giving ex-gratia lumpsum amount in pursuance of circular dated 06/11/2007 appears continuous cause. However, to raising the dispute under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 there is no limitation, therefore, objection raised by first party would not survive. Hence, this Tribunal comes to the conclusion that, the reference is maintainable in the eyes of law.

AS TO ISSUES NO.02 TO 04 :-

14) As stated above the deceased employee late Mr. Sambhaji Varekar initially was employed by Bank of Karad on and from 01/01/1979. Thereafter, said Bank was merged in Bank of India and once again first party Bank has issued him appointment letter dated 02/05/1994. It is also admitted fact that, the Bank has framed scheme on 15/01/2005 thereafter said scheme was replaced by Circular No.101/150 dated 06/11/2007 with intent to provide employment on compassionate ground to the legal heirs or dependents of deceased employee in exceptional cases or to pay ex-gratia lumpsum amount in lieu of appointment on compassionate ground subject to fulfillment the terms and conditions of said scheme. It is also admitted fact that, the deceased employee expired on dated 02/07/2011 before the date of superannuation, therefore, widow of deceased employee in pursuance of circular dated 06/11/2007 has approached to the first party Bank vide letter dated 02/09/2011 with request to provide employment on compassionate ground. Said letter is received by Bank, however, no positive steps taken by said Bank. Thereafter, widow of deceased employee also expired on dated 20/05/2016 and second party has approached to the first party Bank vide letter dated 14/06/2016 along-with proforma and requested for appointment on compassionate ground. Again first party has not communicated to the second party whether he is entitled or not to be appointed on compassionate ground. Therefore, he has sent demand notice of which copy is produced along-with Exh.U-08 at Serial No.02. If perused said letter he has contended that, his father was working with the first party Bank as a Peon since last 33 years. He has expired on 02/07/2011 while on duty. After his sad demise his mother was made correspondence to the Bank for appointment on compassionate ground but no heed was given to her request. Also his mother was expired on dated 20/05/2016 and after the sad demise of his mother, he also applied to appoint on compassionate ground but no Officer of the Bank or higher Manager considered his demand after repeated request. All the time the concerned Officer namely,

Shri. Naniwadekar and Manager Sau. Inamdar given sweet assurance that, he will get the job definitely and also family will get compensation. On third occasion the Bank has not taken cognizance of demand notice, therefore, he was compelled to approach the appropriate Government under Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

15) If perused oral evidence adduced by second party on oath he has deposed that, he is having one brother and one sister and both are married. On dated 02/07/2011 his father was expired. His father was working with the Bank in the capacity of Peon. His mother was applied for compassionate appointment vide letter dated 02/09/2011. His father was expired before 30 years of service, therefore, he is entitled to appoint on compassionate ground. Hence, he has made application dated 14/06/2016 but Bank has not communicated anything, therefore, he was approached to the Labour Commissioner. The Bank has relied on circular dated 06/11/2007 but said reliance is not admitted to the second party. In pursuance of circular he is entitled to appoint on compassionate ground but first party Bank intentionally and deliberately not provided him employment, therefore, he prayed for granting of employment on compassionate ground and ex-gratia lumpsum amount. If perused his cross-examination he has admitted that, on dated 02/07/2011 his father has expired but denied that, after the death of father he has not made any demand to the first party Bank until he was approached to the Government Labour Officer. He also admits that, his father was employed by erstwhile Bank i.e. Bank of Karad on the post of Peon on and from 01/01/1979 and Bank of Karad is merged in the first party Bank on and from 01/05/1994. Also admits that, the first party Bank has issued appointment order to his father on dated 27/05/1994 on the post of Peon. Further admits that, when his father was expired that time his father was above 30 years of age. Also since 1994 his father was served with the Bank more than five years. However, it is denied that, the amount of Rs.14,153.49/- was received towards legal dues. The pension of Rs.8,679/- and amount of gratuity of Rs.4,09,889/- was received. Except family pension, gratuity and provident fund no any other amount received.

16) If perused evidence adduced by first party Bank at Exh.C-07 it appears that, affidavit filed on oath is nothing but reproduction of written statement. However, if perused cross-examination the witness of first party has deposed that, it is not correct to say that, in respect of compassionate appointment he is not conversant with the rules. Also not correct to say that, the correspondence made between the first party and second party is not known to him. Also not correct to say that, in respect of compassionate appointment whatever notes put up by previous Zonal Officer is not known to him. Means everything is well known to the witness. Further admits that, first party Bank is a member of Indian Bank's Association. Other nationalised Banks are also the members of said Association. Also the policy decision is decided by Indian Bank's Association and present first party Bank. Late Mr. Sambhaji Varekar is expired in the year 2011 and at that time the scheme of compassionate appointment which was in existence in the year 2007 was also exists in the year 2011. Immediately after sad demise of Mr. Sambhaji Varekar his widow and present second party have been made application for granting compassionate appointment and to pay all his legal dues. But, do not recollect that, whether the first party Bank has replied or not to the second party about granting or non granting of compassionate appointment. In the entire proceeding no any document produced to show that, the Bank has communicated to the second party about his demand or entitlement. Witness has categorically stated that, document at running Page No.23 filed along-with Exh.U-08 is of first party. But, Bank has not issued such type of letter to the second party. If perused said letter it is unsigned copy, therefore, it cannot be relied upon as said paper is part and parcel of Bank circular. Also admits that, for getting appointment on compassionate ground the second party has fulfill all the procedure applicable to the Bank. However, again witness has denied the fulfillment of criteria or procedure. Rest of the cross-examination is in general.

17) Whatever deposed by both parties it relates to Circular No.101/150 dated 06/11/2007. If perused circular dated 06/11/2007 admittedly Bank has framed the scheme of payment of ex-gratia lumpsum amount in lieu of appointment on compassionate ground or the scheme of compassionate appointment. For compassionate appointment the terms are as under :

- (a) Employee dying while performing official duty as a result of violence, terrorism, robbery or dacoity;
- (b) Employee dying within five years of his first appointment of before reaching the age of 30 years, whichever is later, leaving a dependent spouse and / or minor children.

It is necessary to state that, the deceased employee late Mr. Sambhaji Varekar was expired on 02/07/2011 due to Cancer which is stated by second party. In fact, he was not expired while performing his official duty. Therefore, Clause (a) would not be applicable to get appointment on compassionate ground. As far as Clause (b) is concerned; the first party Bank has issued appointment on dated 27/05/1994 and thereafter he was expired on dated 02/07/2011. In any case it cannot be said that, he was expired within five years of first appointment or before reaching the age of 30 years. Therefore, same clause also would not be applicable for the compassionate appointment. Hence, by not giving compassionate appointment to Mr. Rohit Sambhaji Varekar is legal and justified.

18) However, in circular dated 06/11/2007 it is provided for lumpsum ex-gratia amount in lieu of compassionate appointment. Ex-gratia clause is given at Serial No.03 which is as under :

(I) The scheme for grant of Ex-gratia will be applicable in the following cases of employees :

- (a) Employee dying in harness (other than due to injury while performing official duty as result of violence, terrorism, robbery or dacoity);
- (b) Employee dying due to injury sustained while performing official duty within or outside office premises (other than due violence, terrorism, robbery or dacoity and excluding travel from residence to place of work or back);
- (c) Employee seeking premature retirement due to incapacitation before reaching the age of 55 years.

The second party has claimed that, he is also entitled for ex-gratia lumpsum amount. If perused Clause-5 of the Scheme which speaks about the ex-gratia amount. In Clause-5 (A) it is provided that, "*Ex-gratia amount will be paid to the family of the deceased employee or to the employee seeking premature retirement due to incapacitation. If eligible, provided a request to this effect, is made within six months from the date of death of the employee or seeking premature retirement. The family shall be indigent or penurious circumstances. The family of the deceased employee or the employee seeking premature retirement due to incapacitation will be eligible for Ex-gratia, subject to the ceilings specified in Para 5 (C) below, is less than 60% of the last drawn gross salary (net of taxes) of the employee. The ex-gratia relief under the above Scheme is not an entitlement but may be granted at the sole discretion of the Bank looking into the financial conditions of the family and in deserving and eligible cases only*". If perused Clause-5 (B) and (C) it appears that, in Clause-5 (B) given terminal benefits. The Bank has considered his terminal benefits and drawn total family income of Rs.14,153.49/-. This Tribunal could not understand that, on what basis first party Bank has considered the family income of Rs.14,153.49/-. Further, first party has not proved or not produced any document on record showing that, his family income is less than 60% of the last drawn gross salary of the employees. In present case, the second party may be entitled for ex-gratia amount as per circular dated 06/11/2007 in the cadre of subordinate staff.

19) The second party relied on judgments of the Hon'ble Bombay High Court and the Hon'ble Andhra Pradesh High Court in the case of *Mahesh Singh Bisht V/s. Canara Bank, Mumbai, reported in 2017, II, C.L.R., Page 992 and V. Mallikarjuna V/s. The Chairman, decided on 16/04/2021*.

As far as first authority is concerned; in this case the petitioner's son who died of massive cardiac arrest on 14/07/2001, while in service of the respondent Bank as an Armed Guard. Therefore, he sought compassionate appointment in respondent Bank, as per scheme in vogue in the Bank. The Hon'ble Court held that, (i) the petitioner, being the son of the deceased employee of the Bank, is entitled to get the compassionate appointment in the Bank, but on the pretext of availability of lumpsum ex-gratia payment, the Bank prolonged the matter for four and half years, and ultimately rejected the application for compassionate appointment or ex-gratia lumpsum amount, that too without assigning any reasons. In fact during the said period about 101 cases of compassionate appointment were considered by the respondent Bank. (ii) The approach of the Officers of the respondent Bank is absolutely insensitive to the peculiar requirement of dealing with cases of compassionate appointment and there is no application of mind of any degree. A conduct not expected from Officers of the public body. (iii) Hence, the Hon'ble High Court considering the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in *Canara Bank and Another V/s. M. Mahesh Kumar, 2015, II, C.L.R., Page 563*, directed for compassionate appointment. Herein present case admittedly the first party Bank has introduced scheme for compassionate appointment or ex-gratia lumpsum amount in lieu of compassionate appointment. Admittedly, second party and his mother who was widow of deceased employee applied but no correspondence was made by Bank. At least it was expected on the part of Bank to communicate the eligibility or non eligibility but failed to do so.

As far as second authority is concerned; in this case the father of petitioner, who worked as Head Messenger in the respondent Bank. He died in harness leaving behind his wife, petitioner, two other sons and two unmarried daughters. There was no other earning member in the family and he has to maintain one can understand the financial position of that family. Due to sudden demise of the bread winner of the family, the family of the deceased employee has to face serious financial problems. The respondent Bank formulated the SBI Scheme for compassionate appointment on compassionate ground in exceptional cases with a laudable object of granting compassionate appointment to enable the family to tide over the sudden crisis due to the death of a bread winner. As and when the respondent Bank introduced such scheme for the benefit of family members of the deceased employees, rejecting the claim of the petitioner by the respondent authorities on the ground that, the petitioner is not entitled for compassionate appointment is unjustified and the Hon'ble Court held and directed to the Bank to consider claim of petitioner for compassionate appointment in any suitable post. As far as this reference is concerned; admittedly there is circular dated 06/11/2007 but second party shall not include or entitled for compassionate appointment. Because, he was not on duty when he was expired and further he was not expired within five years of his first appointment or before reaching the age of 30 years.

20) The learned Advocate for first party has also relied on three authorities those are (i) *State Bank of India and Another V/s. Raj Kumar, reported in 2010 (11) S.C.C., Page 661*; (ii) *State of Madhya Pradesh and Others V/s. Amit Shrivastava, reported in 2020 A.I.R., (S.C.) Page 4541 and (iii) Indian Bank and Others V/s. Promila and Another, reported in 2020, I, C.L.R., Page 454*.

In the said authorities it is held that, appointment on compassionate grounds is not a source of recruitment. On the other hand it is an exception to the general rule that, recruitment to public services should be on the basis of

merit. By an open invitation providing equal opportunity to all eligible persons to participate in the selection process. An appointment under the scheme can be made only if the scheme is in force and not after it is abolished / withdrawn. It follows therefore that, when a scheme is abolished, any pending application seeking appointment under the scheme will also cease to exist, unless saved. The mere fact that, an application was made when the scheme was in force, will not by itself create a right in favour of the applicant. If a scheme provides for automatic appointment to a specified family member, on the death of any employee, without any of the aforesaid requirements, it can be said that, the scheme creates a right in favour of the family member for appointment on the date of death of the employee. There is no inherent right to compassionate appointment. It is right based on certain criteria, especially to provide succor to needy family.

The case laws referred by first party is applicable to the present case because scheme is very much clear. In cases employee was to expired while performing his official duty or within five years of his first appointment or before reaching the age of 30 years. Therefore, second party cannot claim compassionate appointment as per circular dated 06/11/2007.

21) While discussing above issue No.02, the Tribunal has opined that, the second party is not entitled for compassionate appointment. Because the deceased employee was not fulfilling the criteria given in circular dated 06/11/2007. Hence, second party would not entitled for relief of compassionate appointment. However, he would be entitled to ex-gratia lumpsum amount as per Clause-3 (I) (A) of the Scheme dated 06/11/2007. The first party Bank has objected the entitlement of ex-gratia lumpsum amount because the family income of second party shown Rs.14,153.49/-. However, first party failed to produce any calculation of the family income or wages lastly drawn by deceased employee. Further failed to justify that, on what ground he is not entitled for ex-gratia lumpsum amount. Therefore, second party would entitled only for ex-gratia lumpsum amount @ 60% on last drawn gross salary for each month of remaining service from the death of deceased employee. Hence, the findings of above issues are answered **'Partly negative and partly affirmative'** and proceed to pass following Award.

AWARD

- 1) Reference (I.T.) No.01/2018 answered in partly affirmative.
- 2) It is held and declared that, the second party is entitled for ex-gratia lumpsum amount as per Circular No.101/150 dated 06/11/2007 @ 60% of last drawn gross salary for each month of remaining service of the deceased employee not exceeding Rs.6,00,000/- (Six Lakhs Rupees Only).
- 3) The first party Bank is hereby directed to pay the ex-gratia lumpsum amount to the second party as directed above within two (02) months from the date of publication of Award.
- 4) The Award be send to the appropriate Government for its publication.

S.D. SURYAWANSHI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 11 मार्च, 2024

का.आ. 497.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय स्टेट बैंक के प्रबंधन, संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय नं. 1 धनबाद के पंचाट (66/2002) प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल-12012/54/2002- आई आर (बी-1)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 11th March, 2024

S.O. 497.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. 66/2002) of the *Cent.Govt.Indus.Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No.1 Dhanbad* as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of State Bank of India and their workmen.

[No. L-12012/54/2002- IR(B.I)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL -CUM-LABOUR COURT (No. 1),
DHANBAD.

PRESENT: Shri Ananda Kumar Mukherjee,
Presiding Officer / Link Officer,
C.G.I.T-cum-L.C. (No. 1), Dhanbad.

REFERENCE CASE NO. 66 OF 2002

PARTIES: S.C.P. Sinha
Vs.
Management of State Bank of India, Patna.

REPRESENTATIVES:

For the Union/Workman: None.
For the Management of SBI: Mr. Devendra Kumar Verma, Adv.
INDUSTRY: Banking.
STATE: Bihar.
Dated: 19.01.2024

AWARD

In exercise of powers conferred under clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Government of India through the Ministry of Labour, vide its Order **No. L-12012/54/2002-IR(B-I)** dated 12.06.2002 has been pleased to refer the following dispute between the employer, that is the Management of State Bank of India, Patna and their workman for adjudication by this Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of State Bank of India, Bhagalpur in dismissing the services of Sri S.C.P. Sinha, Clerk-cum-Cashier vide their letter No. 97-98/96 dated 27-1-1998 is justified? If not, what relief he is entitled?”

1. On receiving Order **No. L-12012/54/2002-IR(B-I)** dated 12.06.2002 from the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi for adjudication of the dispute, a **Reference case No. 66 of 2002** was registered on 21.06.2002. As none appeared, Notice was issued on 16.08.2021 through registered post, directing parties to appear and take proper steps in support of their claims.
2. The Reference case is fixed up today for appearance of the parties. Mr. D. K. Verma, learned advocate for the management of State Bank of India is present. It is 1.30 pm now. None appeared for the S.C.P. Sinha, the aggrieved employee after issuance of Notice. The regular Presiding Officer has retired from service. I am in charge as Presiding Officer / Link Officer of Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum- Labour Court (No. 1), Dhanbad.
3. On a perusal of the record it appears to me that the workman is not inclined to proceed with the case. Accordingly, the Industrial Dispute is dismissed for default. A No Dispute Award be drawn up.

Hence,

ORDERED

the Industrial Dispute is dismissed for default. A No Dispute Award be drawn up in respect of the above Reference case. Let copies of the Award in duplicate be sent to the Ministry of Labour and Employment, Government of India, New Delhi for information and Notification.

ANANDA KUMAR MUKHERJEE, Presiding Officer/Link Officer,

नई दिल्ली, 11 मार्च, 2024

का.आ. 498.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय स्टेट बैंक के प्रबंधतंत्र, संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय **चंडीगढ़-I** के पंचाट (27/2012) प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल-12025/01/2024- आई आर (बी-I)-113]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 11th March, 2024

S.O. 498.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref.27/2012) of the *Cent.Govt.Indus.Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No.1 Chandigarh* as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of State Bank of India and their workmen.

[No. L-12025/01/2024- IR(B.I)-113]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-I, CHANDIGARH.

Present: Sh. Kamal Kant, Presiding Officer-cum-Link Officer, Chandigarh.

ID No.27/2012

Registered On:-21.11.2012

T.P. Singh S/o Sh. Raunak Singh, Senior Assistant, SBI Bhagha Purana Branch, R/o Karnail Gate, Gali No.6 C/o Sh. Gurmeet Singh, Jgraon, Punjab.

.....Workman

Versus

1. State Bank of India, through its Dy. General Manager, SBI, Zonal Office, Civil Lines, Ludhiana.
2. Asstt. General Manager, (Admn)/ DA, SBI, Zonal Office, Civil Lines, Ludhiana. Now; Regional Manager, SBI, RBO, Ferozepur, Pb./DA.
3. Branch Manager, State Bank of India, Bhagha Purana Branch, Moga.

.....Respondents

AWARD

Passed On:-24.01.2024

1. The workman Sh. T.P. Singh has directly filed statement of claim under Section 2-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947(hereinafter called the Act), with a prayer to reinstate the workman with back wages.
2. During the pendency of the proceedings before this Tribunal the case was fixed for arguments. Ld. AR for Workman has made a statement on 29.08.2018 that workman has been died since long.
3. Since the workman has already been died and no LR's has been impleaded till today, as such this Tribunal is left with no choice except to pass a 'No Claim Award'. Accordingly, no claim award is passed in the present case for non-prosecution by the LR's of the deceased Workman. File after completion be consigned in the record room.
4. Let copy of this award be sent to Central Government for publication as required under Section 17 of the ID Act, 1947.

KAMAL KANT, PO-cum-Link Officer

नई दिल्ली, 12 मार्च, 2024

का.आ. 499.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार के प्रशासन. कमांडर, स्टेशन हेड क्वार्टर, सैन्य क्षेत्र, पटियाला; श्री पवन कुमार बजाज ठेकेदार निवासी एल.आई.जी. 175, अर्बन एस्टेट, फेज़-I, पटियाला, संबद्ध नियोजको और जसविंदर कौर, कामगार, के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय नं. 1 चण्डीगढ़ के पंचाट (138/2016) प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल-12025/01/2024- आई आर (बी-I)-114]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 11th March, 2024

S.O. 499.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. 138/2016) of the *Cent.Govt.Indus.Tribunal-cum-Labour Court -I Chandigarh* as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of The Admn. Commander,

Station Head Quarter, Military Area, Patiala; Shri Pawan Kumar Bajaj Contractor R/o L.I.G. 175, Urban Estate, Phase-I, Patiala, and Jaswinder Kaur.Worker.

[No. L-12025/01/2024- IR(B-I)-114]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-I, CHANDIGARH.

Present: Sh. Kamal Kant, Presiding Officer-cum-Link Officer, Chandigarh.

ID No.138/2016

Registered On:-11.11.2016

Jaswinder Kaur W/o Bhupinder Singh R/o Vill. Bhateri Kalan Tehsil & Distt. Patiala.

.....Workman

Versus

1. The Admn. Commander, Station Head Quarter Military Area, Patiala.
2. Sh. Pawan Kumar Bajaj, Contractor, R/o L.I.G. 175, Urban Estate, Phase-I, Patiala.

.....Respondents

AWARD

Passed On:-23.01.2024

1. The workman Smt. Jaswinder Kaur has directly filed statement of claim under Section 2-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947(hereinafter called the Act), with a prayer to reinstate the workman with back wages.
2. During the pendency of the proceedings before this Tribunal the case was fixed for evidence of workman but none is responding on its behalf. Several opportunities have already been given to the workman for evidence but of no use which denotes that the workman is not interested in adjudication of the matter on merits.
3. Since the workman has neither put his appearance since long nor he has led any evidence to prove his cause against the management as such, this Tribunal is left with no choice except to pass a 'No Claim Award'. Accordingly, no claim award is passed in the present case for non-prosecution of workman. File after completion be consigned in the record room.
4. Let copy of this award be sent to Central Government for publication as required under Section 17 of the ID Act, 1947.

KAMAL KANT, PO-cum-Link Officer

नई दिल्ली, 12 मार्च, 2024

का.आ. 500.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार के प्रशासन. कमांडर, स्टेशन हेड क्वार्टर, सैन्य क्षेत्र, पटियाला; श्री पवन कुमार बजाज ठेकेदार निवासी एल.आई.जी. 175, अर्बन एस्टेट, फेज़-I, पटियाला, संबद्ध नियोजकों और करमजीत कौर, कामगार, के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय नं. 1 चण्डीगड के पंचाट (132/2016) प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल-12025/01/2024- आई आर (बी-I)-115]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 12th March, 2024

S.O. 500.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref.132/2016) of the *Cent.Govt.Indus.Tribunal-cum-Labour Court –I Chandigarh* as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of The Admn. Commander, Station Head Quarter, Military Area, Patiala; Shri Pawan Kumar Bajaj Contractor R/o L.I.G. 175, Urban Estate, Phase-I, Patiala, and Karamjit Kaur.Worker.

[No. L-12025/01/2024- IR(B-I)-115]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-I, CHANDIGARH.

Present: Sh. Kamal Kant, Presiding Officer-cum-Link Officer, Chandigarh.

ID No.132/2016

Registered On:-11.11.2016

Karamjit Kaur W/o Modi Singh R/o Vill. Icchewal, Dist. Patiala.

.....Workman

Versus

1. The Admn. Commander, Station Head Quarter Military Area, Patiala.
2. Sh. Pawan Kumar Bajaj, Contractor, R/o L.I.G. 175, Urban Estate, Phase-I, Patiala.

.....Respondents

AWARD

Passed On:-23.01.2024

1. The workman Smt. Karamjit Kaur has directly filed statement of claim under Section 2-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947(hereinafter called the Act), with a prayer to reinstate the workman with back wages.
2. During the pendency of the proceedings before this Tribunal the case was fixed for evidence of workman but none is responding on its behalf. Several opportunities have already been given to the workman for evidence but of no use which denotes that the workman is not interested in adjudication of the matter on merits.
3. Since the workman has neither put his appearance since long nor he has led any evidence to prove his cause against the management as such, this Tribunal is left with no choice except to pass a 'No Claim Award'. Accordingly, no claim award is passed in the present case for non-prosecution of workman. File after completion be consigned in the record room.
4. Let copy of this award be sent to Central Government for publication as required under Section 17 of the ID Act, 1947.

KAMAL KANT, PO-cum-Link Officer

नई दिल्ली, 12 मार्च, 2024

का.आ. 501.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार के प्रशासन. कमांडर, स्टेशन हेड क्वार्टर, सैन्य क्षेत्र, पटियाला; श्री पवन कुमार बजाज ठेकेदार निवासी एल.आई.जी. 175, अर्बन एस्टेट, फेज़-I, पटियाला, संबद्ध नियोजकों और बिंदु देवी, कामगार, के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय नं. 1 चण्डीगड के पंचाट (133/2016) प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल-12025/01/2024- आई आर (बी-I)-116]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 12th March, 2024

S.O. 501.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. 133/2016) of the *Cent.Govt.Indus.Tribunal-cum-Labour Court -I Chandigarh* as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of The Admn. Commander, Station Head Quarter, Military Area, Patiala; Shri Pawan Kumar Bajaj Contractor R/o L.I.G. 175, Urban Estate, Phase-I, Patiala, and Bindu devi .Worker.

[No. L-12025/01/2024- IR(B-I)-116]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-I, CHANDIGARH.

Present: Sh. Kamal Kant, Presiding Officer-cum-Link Officer, Chandigarh.

ID No.133/2016

Registered On:-11.11.2016

Bindu Devi W/o Sh. Manguru Parsad R/o H.No.251, Guru Nanak Nagar Badungar Patiala.

.....Workman

Versus

1. The Admn. Commander, Station Head Quarter Military Area, Patiala.
2. Sh. Pawan Kumar Bajaj, Contractor, R/o L.I.G. 175, Urban Estate, Phase-I, Patiala.

.....Respondents

AWARD

Passed On:-23.01.2024

1. The workman Smt. Bindu Devi has directly filed statement of claim under Section 2-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947(hereinafter called the Act), with a prayer to reinstate the workman with back wages.
2. During the pendency of the proceedings before this Tribunal the case was fixed for evidence of workman but none is responding on its behalf. Several opportunities have already been given to the workman for evidence but of no use which denotes that the workman is not interested in adjudication of the matter on merits.
3. Since the workman has neither put his appearance since long nor he has led any evidence to prove his cause against the management as such, this Tribunal is left with no choice except to pass a 'No Claim Award'. Accordingly, no claim award is passed in the present case for non-prosecution of workman. File after completion be consigned in the record room.
4. Let copy of this award be sent to Central Government for publication as required under Section 17 of the ID Act, 1947.

KAMAL KANT, PO-cum-Link Officer